

MAKEDONIA

M. B. HATZOPOULOS

(with the collaboration of Paschalis Paschidis)

I. The Region

The name of the region is *Μακεδονία*, -η (Hdt. 5.17.1; Thuc. 1.58.1; Hatzopoulos (1996*b*) ii. no. 1.B9). It is derived from the ethnic *Μακεδών* (Hdt. 5.18.2; Thuc. 1.57.2; *IG* 1³ 89.26), in the Thessalian dialect *Μακετούν* (*SEG* 27 202.10); the feminine form is normally *Μακέτα* (*IG* 11² 9258 (C3)). As Makedonia is simply the land of the *Makedones*, its extent followed Makedonian expansion. By the time of Alexander's accession, it ranged from the foothills of the Pierian mountains to the whole region between Mt. Pindos and the Strymon valley, and between the Peneios and roughly the present Greek frontier. To the south Makedonia bordered on Thessaly. Its southernmost cities were, from east to west, Herakleion and Balla in Pieria, Aiane in Elemia, Aiginion in Tymphaia. To the west it bordered on Epeiros, and its westernmost city was Argos Orestikon in Orestis. To the north-west it bordered on Illyria, and its north-westernmost city was Herakleia in Lynkos. To the north of Makedonia lay Paionia (including Pelagonia). The northernmost Makedonian cities, from west to east, were Styberra in Derriopos, Idomene in Parorbelia, and Herakleia in Sintike. To the east Makedonia bordered on Thrace and, until the annexation of the plain of Philippoi in late Hellenistic times, its easternmost cities, from north to south, were Serrhai in Odomantike, the Bisaltic Pentapolis, and Amphipolis in Edonis. In Roman times, Makedonia reached the Nestos valley in the east and encompassed Pelagonia and Paionia as far north as Mt. Golesniča.

The Makedonian expansion was a gradual process, but the strongest impetus both to conquest and to colonisation was given by Philip II (360–336), who also systematically divided Makedonia into self-governing cities, each with its civic territory, and into administrative districts (see Hatzopoulos (1996*b*) i. 167–260). For practical reasons, the “greater Makedonia” of the reign of Philip II and his Temenid and Antigonid successors has been subdivided into (a) a western part comprising the Old Kingdom, cradle of

the Makedonian power, and Upper Makedonia—that is to say all Makedonian territories west of the Axios—and (b) an eastern part consisting of the new territories between the Axios and the plain of Philippoi, which were incorporated into Makedonia proper by Philip II and his successors. The former areas had been almost entirely settled by Makedonians (who had subjected and mostly driven out or exterminated the indigenous populations), at least since the end of the Archaic period, whereas the latter were colonised in later times, and their former inhabitants had in most cases been permitted to remain in their old homes. Both of these parts, however, were integrated into a unified state, the citizens of which shared the same *politeia* and formed *τῆν . . . χώραν τῆν Μακεδόνων* (*SEG* 12 374.6), Makedonia proper, as opposed to the external possessions of the Makedonian kings south of the Peneios, Mt. Olympos and the Kambounian mountains, west of Mt. Pindos and Lake Lychnitis, north of the present Greek frontier and east of the Strymon valley. The “greater Makedonia” created by Philip II was subdivided into four administrative districts called *ethne* in our sources: from west to east, Upper Makedonia (between Mt. Pindos and Mt. Bermion), Bottia (between Mt. Bermion and the Axios), Amphaxitis (between the Axios and modern Mt. Bertiskos) and Paroreia and Parastrymonia, also known as the First Meris (between Mt. Bertiskos and the plain of Philippoi). Within these large administrative districts subsisted older regional names, often derived from the *ethnika* of their actual or former inhabitants: Elemia, Orestis, Tymphaia-Parauaia, Lynkos, Derriopos in Upper Makedonia; Pieria, Bottia (or Emathia), Almopia in the administrative district of Bottia; Mygdonia, Krestonia, Parorbelia, Bottike, Chalkidike, Anthemous, Krousis in Amphaxitis; Sintike, Odomantike, Bisaltia, Edonis, Pieris in the First Meris. Eordaia, although geographically part of Upper Makedonia, was considered from the political point of view as being part of Bottia since it had always belonged to the Temenid kingdom.

The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally for the first time in the C5l treaty between Perdikkas II and Athens (*IG*¹ 89.26) and internally in the C4l list of priests of Asklepios from Kalindoia (Hatzopoulos (1996*b*) ii. no. 62.6) and in the dedication of Kassandros from Dion, also C4l (ibid. no. 23). For the oldest individual and external use, see, perhaps, *IG*¹ 422.1.79–80 (414/13) (a slave) and *SEG* 34 355.4–6 (365). As expected, we find no individual and internal use, since for a Makedonian within Makedonia the ethnic *Μακεδών* would normally be superfluous.

The region Makedonia is described by the term *χώρα -η* (Hatzopoulos (1996*b*) ii. no. 1.A6 (C4e, restored) and 58.6 (243). If not from C5l (Thuc. 2.99.6, implicitly), from C4f onwards the term *ἔθνος* is used for the people (Ps.-Skylax 66).

Makedonia attracted the interest of city-state writers and developed an indigenous literary tradition only from the reign of Philip II onwards, when it became the dominant power in Greek politics. For this reason, evidence about Makedonian cities is relatively late, although by then urban settlements already had a long history in the area. Thus, many cities attested for the first time in the Hellenistic period most probably existed in the previous period too. Since the rules set down for the present project stipulate that only cities attested as such in the Archaic and Classical periods should be included in the Inventory, cities first appearing in Hellenistic times have been separated from the rest and are listed below along with other doubtful cases. On the other hand, toponyms which have been erroneously regarded as denoting cities by ancient authors or modern scholars have been entirely omitted; the same applies to settlements (mostly villages) first attested in Roman times, or which are mere lexicographical entries without indication of their—even approximate—location and/or date, although many of them, as their dialectal forms show, surely existed in earlier periods.

A special problem arises from urban settlements in Upper Makedonia, particularly Aiane in Elemia, Bokeria in Eordaia, and Herakleia in Lynkos, which are sometimes actually described, *expressis verbis*, as *poleis*. From the administrative point of view, however, the equivalent of the Lower Makedonian *poleis* was not the urban settlement but each of the Upper Makedonian *ethne* such as the Orestai or the Elemiotai, comprising both cities and villages. After some hesitation, I have decided to include Aiane, for which there is enough evidence to allow it to qualify as a *polis* type C, but to exclude Bokeria and Herakleia from the Inventory itself and instead to list them with the other non-*polis* settlements.

Finally, I have decided not to consider unidentified ancient settlements. Makedonia is a vast country which has not been surveyed methodically. We know of many *trapezai*, which are a certain sign of a settlement in historical times. However, the absence of systematic investigation does not allow us to date these settlements precisely, even less to determine their status. A random inclusion of such cases would only contribute to creating an inexact image of the settlement pattern without enhancing our understanding of the *polis* phenomenon in Makedonia.

In Makedonia west of the Axios I have counted forty-two settlements attested either in Archaic and Classical or in Hellenistic times but which can most probably be dated to earlier periods: Agassai, *Aiane*, *Aigeai*, Aiginion in Pieria, Aiginion in Tymphaia, *Alebaia*, Alkomena, *Allante*, *Aloros*, Argos Orestikon, Arnisa, Balla, *Beroia*, Bokeria, Bryanion, *Dion*, *Edessa*, Euia, *Europos*, Gaimeion, Galadrai, Genderrhos, Gortynia, Greia, Herakleia Lynkou, *Herakleion*, *Ichnai*, Keletron, *Kyrrhos*, *Leibethra*, Marina, *Methone*, *Mieza*, Nea[---], *Pella*, Petra, Phylakai, Pimpleia, *Pydna*, Skydra, Styberra and Tyrissa. Of these, five almost certainly (Gaimeion, Genderrhos, Greia, Nea[---] and Pimpleia) and one most probably (Arnisa) did not enjoy *polis* status. Of the remaining thirty-six, only seventeen (those in italics) can be positively dated to the pre-Hellenistic period and qualify certainly (type A), probably (type B), or possibly (type C) as *poleis* and are described in the Inventory below. Two (Bokeria and Herakleia) were, probably, the principal town in a whole region. The remaining seventeen settlements, which are first attested in the Hellenistic period, along with the six villages mentioned above, are listed here in alphabetical order. The principal towns in Eordaia (Bokeria) and Lynkos (Herakleia) have been given a somewhat fuller treatment than the others.

1. Pre-Hellenistic Settlements not Attested as Poleis

***Agassai** (*Agassae*, Ἀκασαί?) Livy 44.7.5, 45.27.1 (*urbs*); Steph. Byz. 59.3 (πόλις); *ethnikon*: Ἀκασαῖος or Ἀκασίτης? (Steph. Byz. 59.3); unlocated settlement, somewhere in Pieria (Papazoglou (1988) 118–19; Hammond (1972) 139 n. 1; Hatzopoulos (1996*b*) 109–10 n. 8). *Barr.* 50, H.

***Aiginion** (*Aeginium*) Livy 44.46.3 (*oppidum*) and 45.27.1–3 (*urbs*); Plin. *HN* 4.33; unidentified location, somewhere in Pieria (Papazoglou (1988) 119–20). *Barr.* 50, R.

Aiginion (*Αἰγίνιον*) Livy 32.15.4, 36.13.6; Strabo 7.7.9; *Gonnoi* no. 35B.6 (δῆμος (C2m)); cf. *IG IX.2 324* (πόλις), 329 (πόλις (c.AD 200, when it was no longer part of Makedonia, but belonged to Thessaly)). Capital of Tymphaia-Parauaia. *Gonnoi* pp. 35–36. *Barr.* 54, H.

Alkomena (*Ἀλκομενά*) Strabo 7.7.9 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 75.15 (πόλις); *IG x.2.2 348* (κώμη (AD 192/3)); *ethnikon*: *Ἀλκομενεύς* (Arr. *Ind.* 18.6); *Ἀλκομεναῖος* (*IG x.2.2 348*). At Bučin near Bela Cerka in Derriopos. Papazoglou (1988) 302–3; Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 85–87, 411–16). Alkomena was apparently one of the urban centres of Derriopos, which as a whole constituted a political entity (cf. *SEG 46 807*: ἐν Δερριόπῳ . . . βουλευτήριον). *Barr.* 49, HR.

Argos Orestikon (*Ἄργος Ὀρεστικόν*) Strabo 7.7.8 (πόλις); App. *Syr.* 63; Steph. Byz. 113.1 (πόλις); *ethnikon*: *Ἄργεσταῖος* (Livy 27.33.1 (*Argestaeum campum*)). Most probably at modern Argos Orestikon (Papazoglou (1988) 236–38). *Barr.* 49, RL.

Arnisa (*Ἄρνισα*) Thuc. 4.128.3. At Vegora or, less probably, at Petrai/Gradista, in Eordaia (Papazoglou (1988) 161–64; Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 94, n. 4). *Barr.* 49, C.

Balla (*Βάλλα*) Theagenes (*FGrHist 774*) fr. 3; Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.37 (cf. 17: πόλις); Steph. Byz. 157.11 (πόλις); *ethnikon*: *Βαλλαῖος* (Theagenes); *Vallaesus* (Plin. *HN* 4.34). Possibly at Palaiogratsianon in Pieria (Papazoglou (1988) 120–22; Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 109–10 and (2003)). Undated and unlocated in *Barr.* 50.

Bokeria (*Βοκερία*) *EAM* 109 (C4/C3, stadium stone); *ethnikon*: *Βοκέρριος* (*AG* 9.149; Papazoglou (1988) 164–66 and J. and L. Robert, *BE* (1971) no. 392 mistakenly write *Βοκκέρριος*) or *Βοκερραῖος* (*Bocerraesus*, in an unpublished boundary stone of the Roman period; cf. *BE* (1997) 364). At Pharangi in Eordaia (cf. Petsas (1966–67) 351, no. 245; Mackay (1976)); probable remnants of a circuit wall (Hammond and Hatzopoulos (1982) 143). Bokeria was the principal urban centre of the *ethnos* of the Eordaioi, who as a whole constituted a political unit equivalent to the *poleis* of coastal Makedonia (cf. the βουλή Ἐορ[δαίων] of the Roman period in *SEG* 48 800). *Barr.* 50, HR.

Bryanion (*Βρυάνιον*) Livy 31.39.5; Strabo 7.7.9 (πόλις). Unidentified location in Derriopos (Papazoglou (1988) 303). *Barr.* 49 (Graište?), CHR.

Eua, Euboia (*Εὔα, Εὔβοια*) Diod. 19.11.2; Strabo 10.1.15 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 284.2 (πόλις); *ethnikon*: *Εὐέστης* (*EAM* 87 (181–180); Livy 42.51.4); cf. the *Εὐιαστική πύλη* in

Beroia (*I.Beroia* 41). At Polymylos in Elemia or Eordaia (*I.Beroia* 41 with comm.; Karamitrou-Mentesidi and Vatali (1997)). *Barr.* 50 (Euboia at Sevastiana?), L.

Gaimeion (*Γαίμειον*) *SEG* 24 524.B21, 35 (C3). Unidentified location, probably in Bottia (Papazoglou (1988) 150). Not in *Barr.*

Galadrai (*Γαλάδρα, Γαλάδραι*) Lycoph. *Alex.* 1444; Polyb. book 13, *apud* Steph. Byz. 196.5 (πόλις); *ethnikon*: *Γαλαδραῖος* (Lycoph. *Alex.* 1342). Unidentified location in Pieria (Papazoglou (1988) 120). Undated in *Barr.* 50.

Genderrhos (*Γένδερρος*) Vavritsas (1977) 10 (κώμη) (C3); *ethnikon*: *Γενδεραῖος* (ibid.), *Γενδέρριος* (*SEG* 27 258, *app. crit.*). Unidentified location near Kyrrhos in Bottia, possibly at Mandalon (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 112). *Barr.* 50 tentatively puts it at Mylotopos (following Papazoglou (1988) 154) but indicates no date.

Gortynia (*Γορτυνία*) Thuc. 2.100.3; Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.36 (πόλις); Plin. *HN* 4.34; Strabo 7 fr. 4 (πόλις); Steph. Byz. 212.1. Perhaps located at Vardarski Rid, near Gevgelija, where recent excavations have revealed several building phases of a walled settlement; most important are the C6–C5e and the C5m–C4 phases, the latter with remains of a monumental public building (Mitrevski (1996)). Papazoglou (1988) 181–82. *Barr.* 50, CHRL.

Greia (*Γρήια*) *EAM* 87 (181–180). *Kome* of Eordaia or Elemia (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 96–102). Undated in *Barr.* 50.

Herakleia (*Ἡράκλεια*) Polyb. 34.12.7 (διὰ Ἡρακλείας καὶ Λυγκηστῶν); *IGBulg* 1 13.35 (ἐπὶ τοῦ Λύκου); *SEG* 15 380 (πρὸς Λύγγον); perhaps one of the *poleis* mentioned by Demosthenes at 4.48; *IG x.2.2 53* (*polis* (second century AD)); *IG x.2.2 73* (*polis* (second century AD)); *ethnikon*: *Ἡρακλεώτης* (*SEG* 15 380; *IG x.2.2 74*). Near Bitola in Lynkestis. Not Herakleia alone, but the *ethnos* of the *Lynkestai* as a whole constituted a political unit equivalent to the *poleis* of Lower Makedonia. For the evidence from the Roman period, see Papazoglou (1988) 259–68, Mikulčić (1974) 199–202, Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos (1985) 14–22 and *IG x.2.2* pp. 29–74. *Barr.* 49, CHRL.

***Keletron** (*Celetrum*) Livy 31.40.1 (r199) (*oppidum*). At Kastoria in Orestis (Papazoglou (1988) 238). *Barr.* 49, HRL.

***Marinia** (*Μαρινιαῖος*) *SEG* 24 524 (C3). At Marina in Bottia (Petsas (1961) 49–55). Not in *Barr.*

Nea[---] (*Νεα*[---]) *SEG* 24 524 (C3). Unknown location in Bottia, probably a *kome* of Mieza. Not in *Barr.*

***Petra** (*Petra*) Livy 39.26.1, 44.32.9, 45.41.4. At modern Petra in Pieria. (Papazoglou (1988) 116–17). *Barr.* 50, HRL.

Phylakai (*Φυλακαί*) Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.37 (cf. 17: *πόλις*); *ethnikon*: *Φυλακαῖος* (*I.Beroia* 140 (C3/C2)), *Phylacaeus* (Plin. *HN* 4.34). Possibly at Moschopotamos, in Pieria (Papazoglou (1988) 120; Hatzopoulos (1996*b*) i. 109–10). Undated and unlocated in *Barr.* 50.

Pimpleia (*Πίμπλεια*) Callim. *Hymn* 4.7; Posidippus 118; Strabo 7 frf. 17 and 18 (*κώμη* of Dion). Possibly at Ag. Paraskevi near Litochoron, in Pieria (Schmidt (1950); Papazoglou (1988) 112). *Barr.* 50, HR.

Skydra (*Σκύδρα*) Theagenes (*FGrHist* 774) fr. 13 *apud* Steph. Byz. 578.8 (*πόλις*); Plin. *HN* 4.34 (*civitas*); Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.36 (cf. 17: *πόλις*); *SEG* 24 530 (third century AD); *ethnikon*: *Σκυδραῖος* (*SEG* 24 524 (C3)). At Arseni in Bottia (Petsas (1961) 44–48). *Barr.* 50 (Loutrokhoroí?), HR.

Styberra (*Στύβερρα*) Polyb. 28.8.8; Strabo 7.7.9 (*πόλις*); Livy 31.39.4; *IG* x.2.2 323–28, 330 (*πόλις*) (all from the Imperial period); *ethnikon*: *Στυβερραῖος* (*IGBulg* v 5003 (C2/C1)). At Čepigovo in Derriopos (Papazoglou (1988) 298–302). *Barr.* 49, HRL.

Tyrissa (*Τύρισσα*) Plin. *HN* 4.34 (*Tyrissaei*); Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.36 (cf. 17: *πόλις*). Most probably at Pentaplanos in Pieria. If the five *tagoi* recorded in a C2e deed of sale found at Asvestario, 6 km to the north of Pentaplanos (*SEG* 47 999) are the supreme magistrates of Tyrissa and not of Pella, Tyrissa was a *polis* in the Hellenistic period (Papazoglou (1988) 158–59; P. Chrysostomou (1997); *BE* (1999) 349). Not in *Barr.*

Of the twenty-five settlements listed above, three (Alebaia, Genderrhos, Pimpleia) are described *expressis verbis* in our sources as *komai*. In any case, all settlements in Upper Makedonia (including Eordaia), even when these are called *poleis*, did not enjoy the full prerogatives of the cities of Lower Makedonia, for these were reserved for the territorial units called *ethne* in our sources, which included both cities and villages, called *politeiai* in our sources of the Roman period. Examples of other such Upper Makedonian settlements are Aiginion in Tymphaia, Alkomena, Bryanion and Styberra in Derriopos, Argos Orestikon and Keletron in Orestis, Euia and Greia in Elemia or Eordaia. Of the remaining nine, Agassai and Aiginion are called *urbes* in Hellenistic times, and Tyrissa seems to have had its own magistrates in the same period. They most probably had inherited this status from the previous period. The same is true of Balla,

mentioned by the C3 writer Theagenes referring to an event that probably took place in the reign of Philip II. Galadrai is mentioned by Lykophron in the early Hellenistic period. Its presence in the work of Polybios guarantees that it was not a mythological invention. Its existence in Classical times is possible and even probable. We should have even fewer doubts concerning Marinia and Skydra, the *ethnika* of which figure in a C3 register of sales. Phylakai, too, the *ethnikon* of which appears in an Early Hellenistic agonistic catalogue, was most probably a city in the previous period. Such favourable indications are lacking in the case of Gaimeion and Nea[---], probably a small place, and also of Petra, the site of which can hardly “contain more than thirty little houses” (Heuzey (1860) 147). To conclude, at least eight more *poleis* (Agassai, Aiginion, Balla, Galadrai, Marinia, Skydra, Phylakai and Tyrissa) should probably be added to the seventeen listed in the following Inventory.

II. The *Poleis*

528. Aiane (Aianaios?) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.10, long. 21.50. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is *Αἰανή*, ἡ (*EAM* 47; Steph. Byz. 37.7; later spelt *Ἐανή* (*EAM* 15)); possibly *Aeane* in Livy 43.21.5 (Megas (1976)). The city-ethnic *Αἰαναῖος* is given by Steph. Byz. 37.9.

Aiane is called a *polis* in the political sense in *EAM* 15, which dates from the second century AD. The ethnic is attested only by Steph. Byz., but there is no reason to doubt its authenticity.

Although Aiane, as the recent excavations at Megale Rachi have shown, was the capital of the kings of Elemia from Archaic times, it is not mentioned in the surviving historical works with the possible exception of Livy 43.21.5 in connection with the first military operations of the Third Makedonian War (Megas (1976)).

The three monumental buildings discovered on the top and on the slopes of the acropolis, one of which is certainly a portico belonging to an agora complex, as well as the urban planning of the residential area, show that Aiane had the external aspect of a *polis* from C6l, to which the oldest of these buildings belong (Karamitrou-Mentesidi (1993), (1994), (1996*a*) 16–32, (1996*b*) 25–29). The power of the Elemiote kings, which in the C4e equalled that of the Temenids of Lower Makedonia, goes a long way to explain the early promotion of their residence to a full-blown city comparable to Aigeai. After the annexation of Upper

Makedonia to the Temenid kingdom and its reorganisation by Philip II, Aiaine remained the capital of Elemia, although from the administrative point of view not Aiaine alone but the whole of Elemia with its other towns and villages constituted a political unit equal to the *poleis* of Lower Makedonia (Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. 89–91).

At Aiaine probably were struck the bronze coins of King Derdas in the C4e. Types: *obv.* galloping horseman, or youthful Apollo, or youthful Herakles; *rev.* club and spearhead, or galloping horseman; legend: ΔΕΡΔΑ, ΔΕΡΔΑΙΟΝ (Liampi (1998)).

529. Aigeai (Aigaios) Map 50. Lat. 40.30, long. 22.15. Size of territory: 2. Type: A. The toponym is *Aiγειαί, αί* (IG iv 617.15) or *Aiγέαι* (Diod. 16.92.1) or *Aiγαιαί* (Diyillos (FGrHist 73) fr. 1) or *Aiγαιαί* (Diod. 19.52.5; *I.Leukopetra* 103) or *Aiγαιί* (Diod. 16.3.5) or *Aiγαιαί* (Theophr. fr. 5.27; Syll.³ 269L) or *Aiγαιά* (Ptol. Geog. 3.12.36). The city-ethnic is *Aiγαιός* (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 26.11; IG xii.8 206.12 (C11)), later spelled *Ἐγέος* (*I.Leukopetra* 73 (AD 229)). Aigeai is called a *polis* in the urban sense by Euphorion fr. 33, van Groningen (rC7) and Plut. *Pyrrh.* 26.11 (r274). A combined description of the urban and political aspects of the community is found in the phrase *ἄστὺ κτίζει πόληος* (where *asty* is Aigeai and the *polis* is the Makedonian state), referring to the foundation of Aigeai in C7 and attested in a Delphic oracle of c.500 (Diod. 7.16; for the date see Hatzopoulos (1996b) 464–65). The epithet *μηλοβότειρα* shows that the toponym was used for the territory as well as for the urban centre (Steph. Byz. 39.1; cf. Just. 7.1.10). The political sense is implicit in the designation of Makedonians as belonging to the citizen body of Aigeai (cf. Syll.³ 269L and *IMagnesia* 10.11–12: *Αἰσχρίων Ἀμ[ύ]ντα Μακε[δ]ῶν ἐξ] Αἰγεῶν* (C3); for the date, see Gauthier, *Prakt* (1984) 98). The earliest attestation of the individual use of the city-ethnic occurs in IG xii.8 206.12 (C11), but in Plut. *Alex.* 41.9 a C4 Makedonian citizen is called *Ἐνρύλοχος Αἰγαιός*.

The territory of Aigeai bordered on that of Beroia to the west and Aloros to the east. The marshes of the mouth of the Haliakmon formed its northern limit, and the heights of the Pierians its southern one. Thus it extended over c.12.5 km from the gorges of the Haliakmon to the river-bed of the Krasopoulis, and over c.5 km of arable territory between the mountain and the marshes (62.5 km²). The territory of Aigeai comprised several minor settlements, of which only one has been identified: Blaganoi (Hatzopoulos (1987a), (1990) 59–60). Although situated on the right bank of the Haliakmon, Aigeai did not belong to Pieria, but, just like

Aloros, to Bottia (Diod. 7.16) or Emathia (Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.36), as this region was called in later times (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 239–47, (1996a)).

According to its foundation legend, Aigeai was originally a Phrygian (Brygian) city called Edessa, and the name Aigeai was first given to it by its Greek Makedonian conquerors (Euphorion fr. 33, van Groningen; Just. 7.1.10 (rC7)). From then on it was the Temenid capital, and it remained a part-time royal residence even after the transfer of the usual residence to Pella under King Amyntas III (Hatzopoulos (1987b)); in particular, it retained its character of royal cemetery at least until the end of the Temenid dynasty.

Citizens of Aigeai are known to have been *proxenoi* of several cities: Delphi (no. 177) (*Syll.*³ 269L (c.300 or 272)), Histiaia (no. 372) (IG xii.9 1187.30 (c.266)) and Magnesia on the Maiandros (no. 852), where the recipient also received citizenship (*IMagnesia* 10 (C3)).

Aigeai does not appear in the list of the *theorodokoi* of Nemea (in 323), but its name can be safely restored on the Argive list of contributors (IG iv 617.15 (c.300)), which could be a reference to *theoroi* (cf. Perlman (2000) 74). Its main deities were Zeus (Arr. *Anab.* 1.11.1) and Herakles Patroos (Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 30). Eukleia (Saatsoglou-Paliadeli (1987), (1992)) and the Mother of the Gods (Drougou (1996)) were also popular.

Excavations at Vergina-Palatisia, begun by L. Heuzey in the middle of the nineteenth century and continued since by C. Romaios, and by M. Andronicos and his students, have unearthed, besides the extensive cemetery (Kottaridi (2002)), two palaces, a theatre, an agora, several sanctuaries and other facilities. The great palace (104.5 × 88.5 m), built around a peristyle court, with porticoes on the north and east sides, an extended balcony beyond the north portico and a monumental gate on the east side, belongs to the C4s, but the smaller one, to the west, seems to be earlier and may be the very structure decorated by Zeuxis in C5l (Andronicos (1984) 38–46; Ginouvès (1993) 84–88; Saatsoglou-Paliadeli (2001)). The C4s theatre (*TGR* ii. 317) lay immediately to the north of the palace. Stone benches rose only to the second row (Drougou (1997)). The theatre is mentioned by Diodorus in his account of the murder of Philip in 336 (Diod. 16.92.5ff). The agora of the city lay to the north of the theatre; it comprised the C4m temple dedicated to Eukleia (Saatsoglou-Paliadeli (1996)). To the north-east of the palace a sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods was discovered, the earliest building phase of which belongs to C4l (Drougou (1996)).

On the acropolis, south of the palace, which dominated the city, no major public buildings have been found (Phaklaris (1996) 70–74).

The C4l circuit wall roughly forms a triangle, with its apex to the south on the acropolis and its base on a line joining the two streams on either side of the acropolis hill probably to the south of the Rhomaïos tomb. It is a pseudo-isodomic structure of local stone with towers at irregular intervals. Monumental gates opened from the acropolis to the south, towards Pieria, to the north towards the city, and west of the theatre towards Upper Macedonia (Andronicos *et al.* (1983) 42–45, (1987) 146–48; Phaklaris (1996) 69–70).

According to legend, Aigeai was founded by the Temenid Perdikkas or Karanos or Archelaos, alone or with an army of Argive colonists in the C7m or C8e (Hammond and Griffith (1979) 3–14).

530. Alebaia Map 50. Unlocated (but see Hatzopoulos (2003) for a possible identification with Bravas). Type: A (rC7). The toponym is *Λεβαίη, ἡ* (Hdt. 8.137.1) *Ἀλ(α)ιβαῖοι* (sc. *τόποι*) (*I.Leukopetra* 12.4 (AD 171/2)), *Ἀλεβία* (*κώμη*; *I.Leukopetra* 106.14 (AD 253/4)). The city-ethnic is unattested but was presumably *Ἀλεβαῖος* (*I.Leukopetra* 12.4). Alebaia is called a *polis*, in the urban sense, exclusively in Hdt. 8.137.1, in the mythical context of the foundation of the Macedonian state by the Temenids. It is not clear whether Herodotos is considering (A)lebaia to be a *polis* in his own time or only in the C7, when the legend he narrates is dated. It is clear, however, that by the Roman period (A)lebaia was not an independent *polis* but a *kome* of Elemia, and it is probable that even earlier not (A)lebaia alone but the whole *ethnos* of the Elemiotai constituted a political unit equivalent to the *poleis* of Lower Macedonia.

531. Allante (Allantaios) Map 50. Lat. 40.45, long. 22.35. (Allante was most probably situated at Nea Chalkedon (Gounaropoulou and Hatzopoulos (1985) 56–61). Military action during the First World War and the construction of a modern settlement after 1922 have destroyed practically all ancient remains.) Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is *Ἀταλάντη, ἡ* (Thuc. 2.100.3) or *Ἀλλάντειον, πό* (Theopomp. fr. 33; *BCH* 45 (1921) 17 III.64 (230–220)) or *Ἀλάντη* (*SEG* 36 331B.21) or *Ἀλλάντη* (Steph. Byz. 76.1). The city-ethnic is [*Ἀταλα*]- *vel* [*Ἄλλα*]-*νταῖος* (*IG* IV 617.17 (C4l); *Ἀλλανταῖος* *SEG* 35 753.12 (c.AD 198)); Steph. Byz. 76.3 suggests *Ἀλλάντιος*; Pliny's *Allantenses* (*HN* 4.35) is not helpful. The only classification in literary sources of Allante as a *polis* is in Steph. Byz. 76.1. The only epigraphic attestation of a *πόλις Ἀλλανταίων* is on a c.AD 198 milestone from

Allante (*SEG* 35 753.12), where the term *polis* is used in the political sense. Allante is called a *chorion* in Thuc. 2.100.3. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested both internally (*SEG* 35 753.12) and externally (*IG* IV 617.17).

The territory of Allante bordered on that of Pella to the north-west, Ichnai to the north and Herakleia to the east, across the Axios; to the south it reached the ancient shoreline. Allante was probably a C5e Macedonian foundation designed to cut off the then Paionian city of Ichnai from the sea (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 111).

Allantian *theorodokoi* were appointed to host *theoroi* from Nemea (*SEG* 36 331.B.21 (331/30–313)). If the ethnic is correctly restored in *IG* IV 617.17, Allante is recorded on the Argive list of contributors of C4l, which may be connected with the dispatching of *theoroi* (cf. Perlman (2000) 74).

532. Aloros (Alorites) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.35, long. 22.30. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is *Ἄλωρος, ἡ* (Ps.-Skylax 66; Strabo 7 fr. 20), and the city-ethnic *Ἀλωρίτης* (Diod. 15.71.1). Aloros is called a *polis* in the urban sense by Ps.-Skylax 66 (C4m). The individual use of the ethnic is attested externally in Diod. 15.71.1 (r368) and Arr. *Ind.* 18.6 (r320s).

The territory of Aloros bordered on that of Aigeai to the west and Methone to the south, while to the north it must have been delimited by the marshes of Lake Loudiake.

Traces of a circuit wall of poros blocks c.1 km long have been spotted (Hatzopoulos (1987b) 38). Excavations begun in 1988 (Apostolou (1998)) have revealed a C4 two-room building, probably a temple, with an adjoining Archaic structure, probably an altar (Apostolou (1991)).

533. Beroia (Beroiaios) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.30; long. 22.10. Size of territory: 4. Type: A. The toponym is *Βέροια, ἡ* (Thuc. 1.61.4), later spelled *Βέρροια* (App. *Syr.* 57 and late Roman sources). The city-ethnic is *Βεροιαῖος* (unpublished C4s inscription from the Perrhaibian *tripolis*; Polyb. 28.8.2); *Βεροιῖος* in *I.Leukopetra* 31.5; *Βαιροιαῖος* in *I.Leukopetra* 84.4–5 or *Βεροιεύς* (Polyb. 27.8.6); *Βερωαῖος* (*IG* IV².1 96.22) is probably a mistake. Beroia is first attested as a *polis* in the political sense in a C4l dedication (*I.Beroia* 29 = Hatzopoulos (1996b) no. 73) and is called a *polis* in the urban sense in Ps.-Skymnos 626 (C2). The term *chorion* is used by Thuc. 1.61.4, and the term *polisma* by App. *Syr.* 57. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in an honorific inscription (*I.Beroia* 59 (C1)). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a consecration from the sanctuary of Leukopetra (*I.Leukopetra* 31.5 (AD 192/3)) and externally in an unpublished dedication from

the Perrhaibian Tripolis (cf. Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 156, n. 15 (C4s)) and in a C3f Epidaurian list of *theorodokoi* (IG IV².1 96.22).

The territory of Beroia bordered on that of Mieza to the north, Pella to the north-east, Aigeai to the south-east and on the regions of Eordaia to the north-west and Elemia to the south-west. Among the secondary settlements of the original territory of Beroia, we know the names of Kyneoi, Aurantion, Kannonea and Droga (Hatzopoulos (1990)).

The constitution of Beroia, like the constitution of all the cities of Makedonia, had a pronounced aristocratic character. Not only slaves, but also freedmen, their sons, male prostitutes and craftsmen were excluded from civic life (Gauthier and Hatzopoulos (1993) 78–87), and full enfranchisement probably was subject to a minimum census in landed property (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 209 n. 1). The chief executive official was the *epistates* (Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 73), who—at least later—was assisted by a board of magistrates who may have been called *tagoi* (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 156).

The patron deity of Beroia was Herakles Kynagidas, who was revered as the ancestor of the royal family—not only of the Temenids, but also later of the Antigonids (Edson (1934) 226–32; Allamani-Souri (1993b); Hatzopoulos (1994a) 102–11). The cult of Asklepios was also important (Voutiras (1993) 257), and his priest was eponymous, as in all Makedonian cities (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 152–54). His cult was, at least later, associated with those of Apollo and Hygieia (*I.Beroia* 16 (C3s)). The cult of Dionysos was an ancient one (cf. the epistylon of the theatre bearing a dedication to the god, *I.Beroia* 21 (C4l)); with the epithets Agrios, Erikryptos, Pseudanor it is attested only in Imperial times, but, given its archaic character, it certainly had much earlier origins (Hatzopoulos (1994a) 65–85). From the Hellenistic period are attested cults of Athena (*I.Beroia* 17), Ennodia (*I.Beroia* 23), Hermes (*I.Beroia* 24), Pan (*I.Beroia* 37) and Atargatis (*I.Beroia* 19). Beroia is recorded on the Argive list of contributors (IG IV 617.17 (C4l)), which may be connected with the dispatching of *theoroi* (cf. Perlman (2000) 74).

The failure of the Athenians to capture Beroia in 432 (Thuc. 1.61.4) probably implies that at least part of the city, such as the acropolis situated in the western extremity, was already fortified. Traces of a C4l circuit wall made of local poros have been discovered in different parts of the modern town (Petkos (1997) 272). There were at least three gates, one of which bore the name *Ἐὐσιαστική* (*I.Beroia* 41; cf. Brocas-Deflassieux (1999) 37–41). The continuous habitation of the site from the Iron Age to the present (cf. Allamani-Souri

(1993a); Allamani-Souri and Apostolou (1992) 97) have left very few traces of the ancient town plan. It is presumed that the ancient agora and main road axes correspond to the modern civic centre and road system (Brocas-Deflassieux (1999) 99–101). The *stadion* has been located in the eastern outskirts of the city. Epigraphic finds have permitted the location of the *gymnasion*—first attested in the Hellenistic period—in the same area south of the *stadion* (Brocas-Deflassieux (1999) 87–90). A late Classical or early Hellenistic epistylon with a dedication to Dionysos (*I.Beroia* 21) provides evidence for the functioning of the theatre in that period.

534. Dion (Diestes) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.10, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 4. Type: [A]. The toponym is *Δῖον*, *τό* (Thuc. 4.78.6; *Staatsverträge* 308.9), *Δεῖον* (SEG 31 630). The city-ethnic is *Διέστης* (SEG 48 785; Steph. Byz. 522.3) or *Διάστης* (Paus. 9.30.8) or *Δεῖος* (Oikonomos (1915) no. 4) or *Διεύς* (Steph. Byz. 232.5). The form *Διαῖος* attested on coins (Hatzopoulos and Psoma (1999) 10–12) has nothing to do with Makedonian Dion.

In Ps.-Skylax, the chapter about Makedonia (66) opens with *πρώτη πόλις Μακεδονίας Ἡράκλειον, Δῖον . . .* Thus, Dion is implicitly classified as a *polis* in the urban sense in C4f, and explicit references are found in later sources, both literary (Paus. 10.13.5 (rC6l/C5e); cf. *CID* I 1) and epigraphical (Oikonomos (1915) no. 4 (early second century AD)). Thuc. 4.78.6 calls Dion a *polisma*. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in a C2e letter of Philip V to the city (SEG 48 785). In the same letter *polites* occurs (cf. the *χῆραι πολίτιδες* in a Hellenistic catalogue of names: Pandermalis (2002) 381–82).

The territory of Classical Dion bordered on that of Leibethra to the south, Pydna to the north-east and possibly Phylakai to the north-west. We know the name of only one of its secondary settlements: Pimpleia, called *kome* by Strabo at 7 fr. 17, which was famous because of its connection with the legend of Orpheus and the cult of the Muses (Schmidt (1950)).

Dion was the religious centre of Makedonia at least from C5 and probably much earlier (cf. Diod. 17.16.3). The patron deity of Dion was Olympian Zeus, to whom the city owed its name (Just. 24.2.8) and who was venerated along with the Muses (Diod. 7.16.3). Other communal cults were those of Demeter, Dionysos, the Mother of the Gods, Aphrodite, Baubo, Orpheus, Athena, Eileithyia, Asklepios and Hermes. Sarapis and Isis are also attested from early Hellenistic times onwards (Pandermalis (1977), (1993); Hatzopoulos (1994b)

106). The most important religious but also political event at Dion, and in Makedonia as a whole, was the *panegyris* of Olympia held in the month of Dios and lasting nine days (Diod. 17.16.4). Among other contests it included the *pentathlon*, the *dolichos* and the *taurotheria* (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 129 n. 2; cf. *BE* (1978) no. 232). Dion maintained close relations with Delphi from the Archaic period (*CID* 11 (C6/C5e); cf. Paus. 10.13.5 and Mari (2002) 29–31).

From a C4m fiscal law (Hatzopoulos (1996b) ii. no. 56) and a C4l decree (*ibid.* no. 57), both unpublished, we are informed that Dion had fewer than ten *archontes* and at least two *tamiai*.

The site of Dion comprises the sanctuaries area in the open plain and the walled city to its north. The latter occupies an area of c.43 ha, which justifies the descriptions of Thuc. 4.78.6 (*πόλισμα*) and Livy 44.7.3 (*urbem non magnam*). The rectangular grid-line of the street planning, leaving an open space for the agora, is contemporary with the erection of the walls (Stephanidou-Tiveriou (1998) 216–23). These, 2.60–3.30 m wide, date from C4l and were probably built by Kassandros (after 305?). In their pre-Roman phase they had a regular rectangular perimeter of c.2,625 m and about sixty towers. Of a probable total of at least six or seven gates, four have been identified so far. One of the northern ones, leading to two consecutive courtyards, was probably the main entry to the city. The walls were built from local conglomerate stone. Above the stone substructure rose a brick superstructure of indeterminate height (Stephanidou-Tiveriou (1988)).

In the open plain several sanctuaries have been located: two *megaron*-shaped temples of Demeter adjacent to each other (in which the Mother of the Gods, Baubo and Hypolympidia Aphrodite were probably worshipped as well) date from C6l (Pingiatoglou (1996); Pandermalis (1999) 60–73); near the theatre lay the small C5 temple of Asklepios (Pandermalis (1999) 84–87); finally, the famous temple and temenos of Olympian Zeus has now been located in the south-eastern part of the sanctuaries area (Pandermalis (1999) 44–59, (2000) 291–92). Other important public buildings in the open plain are the C4e theatre, which was rebuilt in Hellenistic times (Karadedos (1986) 337–40) and the C6l *stadion* (Leake (1835) 409 and now Pandermalis (1999) 76, 80–81).

535. Edessa (Edessaioi) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.45, long. 22.05. Size of territory: ? Type: C. The toponym is Ἔδεσσα, ἦ (*IG* IV 617.16 (C4l); Strabo 7.7.4). The city-ethnic is Ἐδεσσαῖος (*F. Delphes* III.3 207.2 (C3m)), also spelt

Ἐδεσσῆος (Tataki (1994) no. 56). Edessa is called a *polis* in Diod. 31.8.8 (r167), probably in the political, urban and territorial senses combined. For late attestations of the urban sense, see Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.39 (cf. 17), and for the political sense, see Demitsas no. 3 (second or third century AD). The term *polisma* is attested in App. *Syr.* 57, and the term *polites* in Antoninus (1879) 227, no. 26. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in *SEG* 36 615.4 (c.AD 200). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in Cormack (1973) no. 4 (second century AD) and externally in *F. Delphes* III.3 207.2 (C3m).

The territory of Edessa bordered on the region of Almopia to the north, on the territories of Kyrrhos to the east, on those of Marinia and Skydra to the south, and on the region of Eordaia to the west (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 112).

The constitution of Edessa is known to us only from inscriptions of the Roman period (e.g. *SEG* 24 531.6 (AD 180/1)), which is also the earliest attested public enactment; Antoninus (1879) 227, no. 26). Edessaian were granted *proxenia* by Delphi (*F. Delphes* III.3 207.2 (C3m)) and Haliartos (*IG* VII 2848.4 (C3?)), and received citizenship from Larisa (*SEG* 27 202 (220–210)). Edessa is recorded on the Argive list of contributors of C4l, which may be connected with the dispatching of *theoroi* (*IG* IV 617.16; cf. Perlman (2000) 74).

The cult of Herakles is mentioned by Hesychius, s.v. Ἐδεσσαῖος, and is attested epigraphically (Struck (1902) 310 no. 15 and, with the epithet Kynagidas, in two unpublished C2s and C1m inscriptions). From the same period date inscriptions referring to the cults of Zeus Hypsistos (P. Chrysostomou (1989–91) 30–34) and Parthenos (Hatzopoulos (1995)). Evidence for other cults is of later date.

A probably C4l (A. Chrysostomou (1988) 60, (1996) 174) wall enclosed both the acropolis (triangular perimeter, one tower on the north-west apex of the triangle and one on each of the west and north sides) and the lower city (polygonal perimeter, 2.4–3 m wide) covering an area of 3.5 and 23 ha respectively (A. Chrysostomou (1987), (1996)). The walls are mentioned by Polyæn. 2.29.2 (r274). The only public monuments known are the temple of Ma and its stoas, which are epigraphically attested (Hatzopoulos (1995) 126). The site has been occupied continuously since the Bronze Age, which accounts for the lack of Archaic and Classical remains (A. Chrysostomou (1996) 180–82); however, Livy 45.30.5 refers to Edessa as among the *urbes nobiles* of central Makedonia in 167, and it was presumably already so in the Classical period.

536. Europos (Europaioi) Map 50. Lat. 40.55, long. 22.35. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is *Ἐὐρωπός, ἡ* (Thuc. 2.100.3; Strabo 7.7.9; cf. Kotzias, *AA* 54 (1939) 257 (inscribed tiles)), *Ἰρωπός* (App. *Syr.* 57; *BCH* 45 (1921) 17, III.62). The city-ethnic is *Ἐὐρωπαῖος* (*F.Delphes* III.4 405.3 (C3e)) or *Ἐὐρώπιος* (*I. Oropos* 98 (C3l)). Europos is called a *polis* in the urban sense in Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.36 (cf. 17) and in the political sense in two honorific decrees for Roman generals (*SEG* 41 570 (c.110), 42 575 (c.39–38)). Thuc. 2.100.3 calls Europos a *chorion*. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in *SEG* 41 570 (c.110) and externally in the C4l contribution list from Argos (*IG* IV 617.17). For the earliest individual use of the city-ethnic, see the *proxenia* decree from Delphi (*F.Delphes* III.4 405.3 (C4l)).

The territory of Europos bordered on those of Pella to the south-west, Ichnai to the south-east and Gortynia to the north.

Citizens of Europos received the *proxenia* at Delphi (*F.Delphes* III.4 405.3 (C4l)). A cult of Artemis Elaphebolos is attested in a C3 inscription (*SEG* 43 399). The Europaiaans are recorded in the Argive list of contributors of C4l, which may be connected with the dispatching of *theoroi* (*IG* IV 617.17; cf. Perlman (2000) 74).

Europos was most probably a walled city in 429, since Sitalkes besieged it but was unable to capture it (Thuc. 2.100.3). Of its public buildings we know only of an aqueduct mentioned in an inscription of Imperial times (*SEG* 38 608). Ongoing excavations aim to delimit the settlement; sporadic finds, such as an unpublished late Archaic *kouros* (Savvopoulou (1988) 137), testify to Europos' importance as a trading centre of the Axios valley.

537. Herakleion (Herakleiotai) Map 50. Lat. 40.00, long. 22.40. Size of territory: 3. Type: A. The toponym is *Ἡράκλειον, τό* (Damastes (*FGrHist* 5) fr. 4.3; Ps.-Skylax 66; *IG* I³ 77.v.21 (*Ἐράκλειον*)), *Ἡράκλεια, ἡ* (Steph. Byz. 304.3). The city-ethnic is *Ἡρακλειώτης* (*Gonnoi* 93). Herakleion is called a *polis* in the urban sense in Ps.-Skylax 66. The collective use of the ethnic is attested externally in *Gonnoi* 93B.24 (C3l).

The territory of Herakleion bordered on that of Gonnoi to the south-west (see the dossier in *Gonnoi* 93–107), Leibethra on the north and possibly Homolion, beyond the Peneios, before the foundation of Phila on the mouth of that river in Hellenistic times.

Herakleion became a member of the Delian League some time between 430/29 and 425/4 or, at least, the Athenians claimed its membership and had it assessed for a tribute of

1,000 drachmas (*IG* I³ 71.IV.108, completely restored; 77.v.21).

Herakleion appears as a walled city in 169 (Polyb. 28.11.1; Livy 44.9.1–9), but its fortifications most probably date from C5, since the city could successfully challenge the authority of Perdikkas II and remain a member of the Delian League for years. Presumably, the walls covered the entire hill, since Heuzey (1860) 92–93 saw remains of them at the bottom of the hill, near the river bank.

538. Ichnai (Ichnaios) Map 50. Lat. 40.45, long. 22.35. (On the location of Ichnai on the right bank of the Axios, see Hatzopoulos (2001) 159–60.) Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is *Ἰχναί, αἱ* (Hdt. 7.123.3; *BCH* 45 (1921) 17.III.63), *Ἰχναί* (Eratosthenes according to Steph. Byz. 342.17, but probably referring to the Thessalian Ichnai; cf. Steph. Byz. 152.16). The city-ethnic is *Ἰχναῖος* (*IG* II² 8944 (undated)). Ichnai is called a *polis* in the urban sense in Hdt. 7.123.3 and in the political sense in a treaty(?) between that city and Dikaia(?) (Struck (1902) 310 no. 15.2 (undated)). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins of C5e (*infra*) and in inscriptions (Struck (1902) 309 no. 14.6 and 310 no. 15.2). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested in a Delphic C3m proxeny decree (*F.Delphes* III.3 207.3 (C3m)) and in an undated Attic sepulchral inscription (*IG* II² 8944).

The name of the territory of Ichnai might be *Ἰχναίων χώρα* (Hsch. s.v. *Ἰχναίων*, unless the reference is to the homonymous Thessalian city). It bordered on the territories of Pella to the south-west, Allante to the south, Tyrissa to the north-west, and probably Herakleia in Mygdonia to the east, across the Axios. The probable site of the urban centre has been totally destroyed by intense agricultural activity (*ArchDelt* 49 (1994) *Chron.* 455).

Two fragments of an inscription of unknown date might belong to a treaty between Ichnai and Dikaia (Papazoglou (1988) 155–56). A citizen of Ichnai was awarded *proxenia* by Delphi (*F.Delphes* III.3 207.3 (C3m)); another Ichnaian was appointed *theorodokos* for *theoroi* arriving from the same city (*BCH* 45 (1921) 17 III.63 (c.220)).

Judging by the onomastic evidence, Ichnai must have been originally a Paionian settlement which already in Archaic times received an influx of Southern Greek colonists. After the Makedonian conquest, settlers from the Old Kingdom were added to its population (cf. Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 107 n. 1). It seems that citizens of Ichnai, in their turn, participated in the Makedonian colonisation of Amphipolis (Hatzopoulos (1991) 86).

Before the Makedonian conquest, Ichnai struck silver staters and octadrachms (c.490–480). Types: *obv.* male figure, usually between two bulls, or beside a horse; *rev.* wheel, or cross in an incuse square; legend: [IX]NAI[ON], IXNAI, IXNAON, IXNAION (Gaebler (1935) 63–65; Price and Waggoner (1975) 29–30, 117; Papazoglou (1988) 155; SNG Cop. Macedonia 183–84).

539. Kyrrhos (Kyrrhestes) Map 50. Lat. 40.50, long. 22.15. Size of territory: 4? Type: B. The toponym is *Κύρρος*, ἡ (Thuc. 2.100.4; Steph. Byz. 430.17; Vavritsas (1977) 8), *Κύρνος* (Diod. 18.4.5, MSS, apparently a mistake), *Κύριος* (in the MS of Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.36; cf. the form *Scurio* (*It. Burd.* 606.3). The city-ethnic is *Κυρρέστης* (SEG 40 520; Plin. *HN* 4.34: *Cyrrstae*; cf. SEG 27 258 (Roman)) or *Κυρραῖος* (SEG 43 435.3 (early third century AD)). The only attestations of Kyrrhos as a *polis* (in the urban sense) are Plin. *HN* 4.34 and Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.36 (cf. 17), but its mention alongside Dion and Amphipolis in Alexander's *Ῥπομνήματα* (*infra*) leaves no doubt that Kyrrhos too was a *polis* already in C4. The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on a second century AD boundary stone (SEG 40 520). For the individual and external use of the city-ethnic, see SEG 43 435 (early third century AD).

The territory of Kyrrhos bordered on the territories of Edessa to the west, Skydra to the south-west, Pella to the south-east, Tyrissa to the east, and Europos to the north-east. An unpublished C3 decree (cf. Vavritsas (1977)) reveals that Genderrhos was a *kome* of Kyrrhos. The name of another *meros* (*kome*?) of the city, Mandarai, is preserved in Steph. Byz. 430.17.

The earliest public enactment of Kyrrhos is an unpublished C3 decree concerning public works in the vicinity and in the agora of the city (Vavritsas (1977)).

Kyrrhos was renowned for its sanctuary of Athena Kyrrhestis, which was located on the hill of Palaiokastron (Vavritsas (1977)). It would be tempting to interpret the mass of semi-worked limestone blocks in a nearby C4s quarry (Bakalakis (1970)) as preliminary work for the *ναὸς πολυτελής* of Athena which Alexander was planning to build in Kyrrhos (Diod. 18.4.5); two C4l/C3e poros capitals—probably of a temple—may attest a later attempt to implement Alexander's plan (Haddad (1993); Adam-Veleni (1998) 6). The sanctuary of Artemis Agrotera is known from dedications of the Roman period (Panayotou and Chrysostomou (1993) 379–80). The agora of the city is mentioned several times in the C3 unpublished decree (Vavritsas (1977) 8; Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 438–39).

The patron deity of Kyrrhos was Athena, for whom Alexander was planning to build a magnificent temple at the time of his death (Diod. 18.4.5). The cult of Athena Kyrrhestis, which is also attested epigraphically (SEG 27 258 (Roman)), was transferred to the homonymous city in Syria. Other communal cults were those of Artemis Agrotera (attested by Roman evidence: SEG 30 553–54, 35 750, 43 404–5) and of Zeus Hypsistos (P. Chrysostomou (1989–91) 40–41).

540. Leibethra (Leibethrios) Map 50. Lat. 40.50, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 3. Type: C. The toponym is *Λεῖβηθρα*, τὰ (Aesch. fr. 83a.9; BCH 45 (1921) 17 III.53) or *Λεῖβηθρον* (Strabo 10.3.17) or *Λίβηθρα* (Paus. 9.30.9). The city-ethnic is *Λεῖβήθριος* (Arist. fr. 552; *Gonnoi* 2.6) or *Λιβήθριος* (Paus. 9.30.11).

Leibethra is called a *polis* in the urban sense in Paus. 9.30.9, referring to the mythical period. The term *patris* is used in *Orph. Argonaut.* 1374. Alternative site-classifications are *ethnos* (Arist. fr. 552), *chorion* or *oros* (Strabo 10.3.17), *topos* (Hsch., s.v. *λεῖβηθρον*) and *σκοπιή* (Lyc. *Alex.* 275). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on an inscribed weight of one mina (SEG 27 283 (undated)) and externally in Arist. fr. 563 and in a C3e decree from Gonnoi (*Gonnoi* 2.6).

Originally populated by Thracian Pieres, Leibethra and this part of Pieria were conquered by the Makedonians c.C7 (Strabo 10.3.17; cf. Hammond (1972) 417).

According to the legend mentioned by Pausanias (9.30.11), the city was destroyed by the river Sys. The topography of the site and the remains of the walls make such a “destruction” by the four torrents in the area quite possible (Kotzias (1948–49) 33–34), although the continued existence of the city is secured by Classical (Pritchett (1991) 127) and Hellenistic (Kotzias (1948–49) 34) remains, by the mention of the city in the C3 inscription from Gonnoi (*Gonnoi* 2.6) and by the C3l Delphic list of *theorodokoi* (BCH 45 (1921) 17 III.53).

The territory of Leibethra probably extended from the mountainous area of Lower Olympos to the valley of Sys (Helly (1973) 35–36; *Gonnoi* 5). The city bordered on Gonnoi to the south-west, presumably on Herakleion to the south, and Dion to the north.

The cults of Orpheus, the Nymphs, the Muses and Dionysos are attested in literary sources (Kotzias (1948–49) 26–28). The cult of the latter deity has now found a possible archaeological confirmation (SEG 27 283).

The legend of the city's destruction mentions the existence of walls (Paus. 9.30.11). Kotzias ((1948–49) 33–34), who

excavated the site, discovered part of a circuit of 1.5 m-wide walls. According to Pritchett ((1991) 127), the circuit was no more than 500 m long. Recent work has confirmed that the acropolis (1.5 ha) was walled and that the site was not abandoned until C1 (*ArchDelt* 50 (1995) *Chron.* 497–98).

541. Methone (Methonaios) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.30, long. 22.35. Size of territory: ? Type: A. The toponym is *Μεθώνη*, ἡ (Thuc. 6.7.3; *IG* II² 130), *Μεθώνα* (*IG* IV².1 94.1b.8). The city-ethnic is *Μεθωναῖος* (*IG* I³ 61; Thuc. 4.129.4; Arist. fr. 551–52). Methone is called a *polis* both in the urban sense (Dem. 9.26; Ps.-Skylax 66) and in the political sense (*IG* I³ 61.44–45; Plut. *Mor.* 293B, probably derived from Aristotle's treatise). In Din. 1.14 *polis* is used in both senses simultaneously. The *politai* of Methone are mentioned in Diod. 16.34.5 (r354), and there was an Aristotelian *Methonaion politeia* (fr. 551–52). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in abbreviated form on coins (*infra*) and externally in *IG* I³ 61.1. For the individual and external use of the city-ethnic, see e.g. *IG* II² 9330 (C51).

According to Thuc. 6.7.3, Methone bordered on Makedonia (τῆν ὄμορον Μακεδονία), and its territory (τῆς χώρας τῆς Μεθ[ο]ναίων) is mentioned in *IG* I³ 61.22. The territory of Classical Methone bordered on that of Pydna to the south and Aloros to the north-west. The size of the territory must have been close to 100 km², perhaps a little more. After 354 it must have been added to that of Pydna (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 181).

Methone was originally a Thracian settlement. It was colonised by Eretrians c.730 (Hammond (1972) 425–26) and joined the Delian League after 431 (for the date and the erroneous restoration of the ethnic in *IG* I³ 280.11.67, see Piérart (1988)). It belonged to the Thracian district and is registered in the tribute lists from 430/29 (*IG* I³ 281.11.33, restored) to 415/14 (*IG* I³ 290.111.8) a total of three times, paying a *phoros* of 3 tal. (*IG* I³ 282.11.53). It was assessed for tribute in 425/4 (*IG* I³ 71.111.157 (5 tal.), ethnic completely restored).

In 364 or 363 it was captured by the Athenian Timotheos (Din. 1.14 = 3.17) and became an ally of Athens but probably without becoming a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (Dreher (1995) 26). Methone was conquered and destroyed by Philip II in 354 (Dem. 4.4; Diod. 16.31.6 and 34.4–5). The inhabitants were allowed to leave the city with one garment each; the city itself was razed to the ground, and its territory distributed to Makedonian settlers. A few decades later, old Methone was succeeded by a new settlement 1 km to the north-west of the former city, which, however, did not enjoy the status of *polis* but was probably a

kome of Pydna (Hatzopoulos *et al.* (1990); for the origin of the new settlers, see Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 180–81).

Our only information about the constitutional arrangements of Methone concerns its magistrates, the *archontes* and the *polemarchos* mentioned in Arist. fr. 551. A Methonaian *theorodokos* hosted the *theoroi* from Epidauros (no. 348) (*IG* IV².1 94.b.8) c.360. Another Methonaian is known to have been granted citizenship in Ephesos (*I.Ephesos* 48 (C41)).

Methone was a walled city in 354 (Dem. 1.9; Theopomp. fr. 52; Polyae. 4.2.15; Just. *Epit.* 7.6.14). No remains of the walls are visible today.

Methone struck only one type of bronze coinage in C4f. Types: *obv.* female head to the r; *rev.* lion breaking spear; legend: *ΜΕΘΩ* (Gaebler (1935) 78–79; Psoma (2001) 115).

542. Mieza (Miezaïos/Miezeus) Map 50. Lat. 40.40, long. 22.05. Size of territory: ? Type: B. The toponym is *Μιέζα*, ἡ (Plut. *Alex.* 7.4), *Μέζα* (BCH 45 (1921) 17, 111.59), *Μύεζα* (in the MS of Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.36); the alternative name *Στρυμόνιον* given by Steph. Byz. 452.1 (perhaps quoting Theagenes (*FGrHist* 774) fr. 7) is probably an epithet. The city-ethnic is *Μιέζαῖος* (Theagenes (*FGrHist* 774) fr. 7), later spelt *Μιέζεος* (*I.Leukopetra* 71.8–9), or *Μιέζεός* (Arr. *Ind.* 18.6 (r325)).

Mieza is called a *polis* in the urban sense by Steph. Byz. 452.1, possibly quoting Theagenes (*FGrHist* 774) fr.7 (C3); cf. Ptol. *Geog.* 3.12.36 (cf. 17). For the individual use of the city-ethnic, see Arr. *Ind.* 18.6.

The territory of Mieza is called *Μιέζεοι τόποι* in *I.Leukopetra* 71.8–9; we know the names of two settlements that were probably its *komai*, Gaimeion and Nea [---] (*SEG* 24 524 (C3)). It bordered on the territory of Beroia to the south, Marinia to the north-west, and Skydra to the north-east.

Among the magistrates, the eponymous priest of Asklepios, the *epistates*, *tagoi* and *dikastai* are attested in the Hellenistic period (*SEG* 24 524 (C2f)), and at least the priest of Asklepios and the *epistates* are likely to have existed since C4 (Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 156). The cults of Asklepios (*SEG* 24 524 (C2f)), the Nymphs (Plut. *Alex.* 7.4), Artemis (*SEG* 24 525–26), Herakles Kallinikos (Demitsas (1896) no. 18) and the river god Olganos (Kallipolitis (1952)) are attested in Mieza.

Although the archaeological complex of Leukadia–Kopanos–Naoussa was well known from the nineteenth century, only most recently have excavations started at the very site of the ancient city (Rhomiopoulou (1997)). A large

(over 106 m long) C4 stoa, which might form part of a Asklepieion complex, has come to light (Allamani-Souri and Misaelidou (1992) 203–12; Allamani-Souri et al. (2002)). Moreover, the school that Aristotle founded in Mieza (Plut. *Alex.* 7.4) is almost certainly to be identified with the building complex at Isvoría, to the south-west of the civic centre, where three caves are joined by elaborate *peripatoi*, niches, stoas and staircases (Siganidou and Trochides (1990), with earlier refs.).

543. Pella (Pellaios) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.45, long. 22.30. Size of territory: 4 (P. Chrysostomou (1990) 223). Type: A. The toponym is *Πέλλα*, ἡ (Hdt. 7.123.3; Thuc. 2.99.4; *Syll.*³ 267A.4), earlier (or as an epithet?) *Βούνομος* or *Βουνόμεια* (Steph. Byz. 515.7–8). The city-ethnic is *Πελλαῖος* (Arvanitopoulos (1909) no. 16; Arr. *Anab.* 3.5.3). The alternative forms *Πελληναῖος* of Plut. *Mor.* 339B and *Πελληνός* of Steph. Byz. 515.9–10 are otherwise unknown. Pella is called a *polis* in the urban sense in Hdt. 7.123.3 and Ps.-Skylax 66. At Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.13, *μεγίστη τῶν ἐν Μακεδονίας πόλεων* is used about Pella both in the personal-political and in the urban sense. The earliest attestation of *polis* in a purely political sense is in the *asylia* decree for Kos (*SEG* 12 374.9 (243)). In a verse dedication of Queen Eurydika, wife of Amyntas II, *πολίτις* is used about the female citizens, presumably of Pella (Plut. *Mor.* 14B with *BE* (1984) 249). Pella is called a *polisma* in App. *Syr.* 57 and a *metropolis* in Strabo 16.2.10. Ps.-Skylax 66 writes: *πόλις καὶ βασιλείον ἐν αὐτῇ* (C4m). *πατρίς* is used about Pella in a C4s epigram from Delphi (*SEG* 18 222a), in *AG* 7.139 (C1) and in Strabo 16.2.10. Demosthenes' description of Pella as a *χωρίῳ ἀδόξῳ . . . καὶ μικρῷ* (18.68 (rC4e)) is clearly a rhetorical distortion (cf. Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.13). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in the C2f coinage of the city (Gaebler (1935) 93–97) and externally in the *asylia* decree for Kos (*SEG* 12 374 (243)). For the individual use of the city-ethnic, see Arr. *Ind.* 18.3 (r325), and Arvanitopoulos (1909) no. 16 (C3e).

Pella's extensive territory, *Πελλαία* (Strabo 7 fr. 20), bordered on the territories of Allante to the south-east, Ichnai to the east, Tyrissa to the north, and Kyrrhos to the north-west and to the west. We know the sites of five secondary settlements, at Archontikon, Damianon B, Agrosykia, Leptokarya B and Ag. Nikolaos (Krya Vrysi), and two suburbs, one to the north-west and one to the west of the city (P. Chrysostomou (1990); Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 111–12).

Pella, originally a Paionian settlement, received an important Ionian influx from early Archaic times. It became a member of the Chalkidian Federation for a brief period in

the 380s (Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.13). The transfer of the royal residence to the city in the reign of Amyntas III was accompanied by a significant Makedonian migration which transformed the character of the city, as the onomastics and the archaeological remains show (Hammond and Griffith (1979) 56; Hatzopoulos (1996b) i. 171–73).

There is no evidence for the Classical constitution of Pella; in C3 there is evidence of an *archon*, an *epistates* (*SEG* 48 818), a *boule* and a *demos* (*SEG* 48 817) as well as *tamiai* (*SEG* 12 374). In C4s (*Syll.*³ 267; *SEG* 18 222a) and in C3m (*F.Delphes* III.3 207.2) several citizens of Pella received the *proxenia* of Delphi.

The patron divinity of Pella was Athena Alkidemos (Livy 42.51.2; cf. Gaebler (1935) 93–97). Among other cults, those of Apollo, Artemis, Asklepios, Dionysos, Zeus Meilichios, Herakles Kynagidas, Herakles Phylakos, the Muses and Pan are attested from epigraphic, literary and archaeological sources (*SEG* 24 540; Papakonstantinou-Diamantourou (1971) 38–51; P. Chrysostomou (1989) 105–6). Moreover, the C4l sanctuaries of the Mother of the Gods, of Demeter and of Darron have been uncovered in or near the city (Lilimpaki-Akamati (1987), (1990), (1991), (1996), (2000), (2002)). For none of the cults do we have evidence from the Classical period. A Pellaian *theorodokos* was appointed to host *theoroi* from Nemea (*SEG* 36 331.B.23–24 (323–317); for the identification of the *theorodokos*, see Knoepfler (2001) 187–90). A citizen of Pella was victorious in the Isthmian and Pythian Games (*SEG* 18 222a (C4s)).

Pella was the largest city of Makedonia; for a general description, see Lilimpaki-Akamati (2002). The rectangular C4s wall is of mudbrick upon a stone foundation and predates the C4l grid plan of the town (Siganidou (1987a)). The city had two citadels. The acropolis, situated on the northern hill and covering an area of 6 ha, is entirely occupied by the palatial complex. At the southern end of the city the islet Phakos in Lake Loudiake, which was connected with the mainland via a drawbridge, qualified as an *ἄκρα* and housed the central Makedonian treasury (Strabo 7 fr. 20). The city was built on a regular Hippodamian grid line with two main north–south roads and one west–east road crossing them in the agora area (Siganidou (1990)). The 200 × 182 m-wide agora is surrounded by stoas: the north one probably housed the seat of the politarchs, while on the north-west side of the agora probably lay the city archive; along with the building complex around it, the agora covers an area of ten blocks in the centre of the city (Akamatis (1999)). The palace of the Makedonian kings (central complex C4f) covers the entire acropolis area (6 ha) north of the agora. It consists of

three building complexes, along an east–west axis. Each building complex is composed of two buildings, one to the south, towards the city, and one to the north. All three southern buildings have a large peristyle court. The northern buildings of the west and central complex have bathing facilities. A long *stoa* of more than 153 m with a 15 m-wide propylon forms the southern façade of the central and east complex facing the city (Siganidou (1987*b*), (1996); Ginouvès (1994) 88–91; P. Chrysostomou (1996)). Other public buildings uncovered are a large C4l tholos, probably a *heroon* of Herakles and used as *bouleuterion* by the Makedonian Council (Hadzisteliou-Price (1973)) and the sanctuaries of the Mother of the Gods and Aphrodite in the agora area, of Demeter in the south-east quarter of the city, and of Darron in the south-west quarter (Lilimbaki-Akamati (1987), (1990), (1991), (1996), (2000)). A theatre is mentioned by Plutarch in a C4s context (*Mor.* 1096B).

544. Pydna (Pydnaïos) Maps 49–50. Lat. 40.25, long. 22.35. Size of territory: 3 or 4. Type: A. The toponym is Πύδνα, ἡ (Thuc. 1.61.2; *Gonnoi* 98.7), Πύτνα (*IG* II² 329.13 = *Staatsverträge* 403), Κύδνα, which is considered to be the authentic form of the name (Theagenes (*FGrHist* 774) fr. 5 = Steph. Byz. 390.8–10). The city-ethnic is Πυδναίος (Dem. 1.5; Hatzopoulos (1996*b*) ii. no. 55), Πυδναίος, Πυδδναίος (only on coins: Tselekas (1996) 14); Πυτναίος (*IG* II² 339.b.3). Pydna is called a *polis* in the urban sense at Ps.-Skylax 66) and is listed as a *polis* in the urban and political senses simultaneously at Din. 1.14 = 3.17. The term *asty* is attested in Polyaeus. 4.11.3 (r317), and the term *polichnion* in a *scholion* on Arist. *Rh.* 1411^a9. The earliest epigraphical attestation of the πόλις Πυδναίων is in an honorific decree of c.169 (Hatzopoulos (1996*b*) ii. no. 55). The collective use of the city-ethnic is attested internally on coins (*infra*) and externally perhaps on a fragmentary *asylia* decree (*SEG* 12 374.16 (243)). The individual use of the city-ethnic is attested internally in an honorific decree (Hatzopoulos (1996*b*) ii. no. 55.2 (c.169)) and externally in a C4s Athenian proxeny decree (*IG* II² 339.b.3 (333)).

The territory of Classical Pydna bordered on that of Methone to the north and of Dion to the south, and may have covered over 200 km².

As the recent excavations have shown, Pydna was not a colonial foundation but a Makedonian settlement (Bessios and Pappa (1996) 5). Already in the reign of Alexander I it

belonged to the Makedonian kingdom (Thuc. 1.137.1). In 432 it was unsuccessfully besieged by the Athenians (Thuc. 1.61). In 410 it rebelled against King Archelaos and seceded from the kingdom, but it was besieged again, and captured after a long siege. Its inhabitants were transferred some 4 km inland, perhaps to modern Kitros (Diod. 13.49.2). Apparently the old site was reoccupied already in C4e (Bessios (1990) 241), and in the reign of Amyntas III Pydna seems for a time to have again successfully seceded from the kingdom, since it struck its own coins; but in the reign of Alexander II, at the latest, it seems to have returned to the fold of the kingdom (Hatzopoulos (1985) 253 n. 66; for a different interpretation of the numismatic evidence, see Tselekas (1996) 19–24). In 364 or 363 it was captured by Timotheos (Din. 1.14 = 3.17; for the date see Diod. 15.81.6) and became an ally of Athens, but probably without becoming a member of the Second Athenian Naval League (Dreher (1995) 26). In 357 it was besieged and captured by Philip II (Dem. 1.9; Diod. 16.8.3), presumably by being betrayed to the Makedonians (Dem. 20.63, see Hammond and Griffith (1979) 242–44); it thereafter remained an integral part of the Makedonian kingdom.

Only two temples are attested in the Classical period: that of Athena (*IG* II² 329.13 = *Staatsverträge* 403 (336)) and that posthumously erected in honour of Amyntas III (Habicht (1970) 11–12). Pydnaian *theorodokoi* received *theoroi* from Epidauros c.360 (*IG* IV² 94 I.b.7).

Pydna was a walled city at least from 432 (Thuc. 1.61.3, implicitly; cf. Diod. 19.49.1 (r317)), but probably already in C5e (Bessios and Pappa (1996) 5–6). Traces of the walls were seen by Hammond ((1984) 377). The area enclosed by the walls was c.25 ha, making Pydna one of the largest Makedonian cities in C5e, undoubtedly because of the importance of its harbour (Bessios and Pappa (1996) 6).

Pydna struck bronze coins in C4f. (1) During the reign of Amyntas III, types: *obv.* head of young Herakles wearing lion skin to the r.; *rev.* eagle with closed wings to the r. devouring serpent which it holds with its talons; legend: ΠΥΔΝΑΙΩΝ or ΠΥΝΔΝΑΙΩΝ and once ΠΥΔΔΝΑΙΩΝ. (2) C.364–357: *obv.* female head facing l. or r., wearing ear-ring and necklace, her hair in a sphenone; *rev.* owl to the r., standing on olive branch; legend: ΠΥΔΝΑΙΩΝ (Gaebler (1935) 105–6; Tselekas (1996) 14, 26–30; *SNG Cop. Macedonia* 317).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam-Veleni, P. 1998. "Ἀρχαιολογικά Ἀραβησσοῦ—Mutatio Scurrio", in M. Lilimpaki-Akamati *et al.* (eds.), *Μνείας Χάρων. Τόμος στὴ μνήμη Μαίρης Σιγανίδου* (Thessalonica) 1–11.
- Akamatis, I. M. 1999. "Ἄγορὰ Πέλλας: 15 χρόνια ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐρευνας", in *Ancient Macedonia*, vi (Thessalonica) 23–43.
- Allamani-Souri, V. 1993a. "Beroia", in *Greek Civilisation: Macedonia, Kingdom of Alexander the Great* (Athens) 48–49.
- 1993b. "Ἡρακλῆς Κυναγίδας καὶ κυνηγοί. Νέα ἐπιγραφικὰ στοιχεῖα ἀπὸ τὴ Βέροια", in *Ancient Macedonia*, v (Thessalonica) 77–107.
- and Apostolou, M. 1992. "Σωστικές ἀνασκαφές στὴν πόλη τῆς Βέροιας", *AEMΘ* 6: 93–110.
- and Misaelidou, V. 1992. "Ἀνασκαφικὲς ἐρευνες στὴν ἀρχαία Μίεζα", *AEMΘ* 6: 203–15.
- *et al.* 2002. "Το κτηριακὸ συγκρότημα τῆς Μίεζας: ἐρμηνευτικὲς προσεγγίσεις καὶ προοπτικὲς τῆς ἐρευνας", *AEMΘ* 16: 571–83.
- Andronicos, M. 1984. *Vergina* (Athens).
- *et al.* 1983. "Ἀνασκαφὴ Βεργίνας", *Prakt* 42–54.
- 1987. "Ἀνασκαφὴ Βεργίνας", *Prakt* 126–48.
- Antoninus (Archimandrite) 1879. *Poiesdka v Rymeliuu* (St Petersburg).
- Apostolou, M. 1991. "Ἀνασκαφὴ στὴν Κυψέλη Ἡμαθίας", *AEMΘ* 2: 307–15.
- 1998. "Ἡ ἀρχαία πόλη στὴν Κυψέλη Ἡμαθίας. Ἀνασκαφὴ 1992–1997", in M. Lilimpaki-Akamati *et al.* (eds.), *Μνείας Χάρων. Τόμος στὴ μνήμη Μαίρης Σιγανίδου* (Thessalonica) 33–37.
- Arvanitopoulos, A. S. 1909. *Θεσσαλικά μνημεῖα* (Athens).
- Bakalakis, G. 1970. "Τὸ λατομεῖο τῆς ἀρχαίας Κύρρου (:)", in *Ancient Macedonia*, i (Thessalonica) 172–83.
- Bessios, M. 1990. "Ἀνασκαφές στὸ βόρειο νεκροταφεῖο τῆς Πύδνας (1990)", *AEMΘ* 4: 241–46.
- and Pappa, M. 1996. *Pydna* (Athens).
- Brocas-Deflassieux, L. 1999. *Béroia, cité de Macédoine: étude de topographie antique* (Beroia).
- Chrysostomou, A. 1987. "Τὸ τεῖχος τῆς Ἐδεσσας", *AEMΘ* 1: 161–72.
- 1988. "Νεότερες ἐρευνες τοῦ τείχους τῆς Ἐδεσσας", *AEMΘ* 2: 55–67.
- 1996. "Ἡ Ἐδεσσα στὰ προχριστιανικὰ χρόνια", *AEMΘ* 10: 173–87.
- Chrysostomou, P. 1990. "Ἡ τοπογραφία τῆς βόρειας Βοττιαίας", in *Πόλις καὶ χώρα στὴν Ἀρχαία Μακεδονία καὶ Θράκη. Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη, Ἑλληνογαλλικὲς Ἔρευνες* (Thessalonica) 205–38.
- 1989. "Ἡ λατρεία τῆς Συρίας Θεᾶς (Ἄταργάτιδος) στὴ Δυτικὴ Μακεδονία", *AEMΘ* 3: 103–17.
- 1991. "Δυτικομακεδονικὰ εὐχαριστήρια στὸ Δία Ὑψίστο", *AEMΘ* 5: 97–110.
- 1989–91. "Ἡ λατρεία τοῦ Δία ὡς καιρικοῦ θεοῦ στὴ Θεσσαλία καὶ στὴ Μακεδονία", *ArchDelt* 44–46: 21–72.
- 1996. "Τὸ ἀνάκτορο τῆς Πέλλας", *AEMΘ* 10: 107–42.
- 1997. "Βασιλικὸι δικαστὰι καὶ ταγοὶ σὲ μιὰ νέα ἐπιγραφὴ μὲ ὠνὲς ἀπὸ τὴν κεντρικὴ Μακεδονία", *Tekmeria* 3: 23–45.
- Cormack, J. M. R. 1973. "Inscriptions from Pella, Edessa and Beroea", *ArchPF* 22: 203–16.
- Demitsas, M. G. 1896. *Ἡ Μακεδονία ἐν λίθοις φθεγγόμενοις καὶ μνημείοις σωζομένοις* (Athens).
- Dreher, M. 1995. *Hegemon und Symmachoi: Untersuchungen zum zweiten attischen Seebund* (Berlin).
- Drougou, S. 1996. "Βεργίνα 1990–1997: Τὸ ἱερὸ τῆς Μητέρας τῶν Θεῶν", *AEMΘ* 10: 41–54.
- 1997. "Das antike Theater von Vergina: Bemerkungen zu Gestalt und Funktion des Theaters in der antiken Hauptstadt Makedoniens", *AM* 112: 281–305.
- Edson, C. 1934. "The Antigonids, Heracles, and Beroea", *HSCP* 45: 213–46.
- Gaebler, H. 1935. *Die antiken Münzen von Makedonia und Paionia*, ii (Berlin).
- Gauthier, P., and Hatzopoulos, M. B. 1993. *La Loi gymnasiarchique de Béroia*, *Meletemata* 16 (Athens).
- Ginouvés, R. 1994. "The Palaces", in R. Ginouvés (ed.), *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton and Athens) 84–91.
- Gounaropoulou, L., and Hatzopoulos, M. B. 1985. *Les Milliaires de la Voie Egnatienne entre Heraclée des Lyncestes et Thessalonique*, *Meletemata* 1 (Athens).
- Habicht, C. 1970. *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte 2*, *Zetemata* 14 (Munich).
- Haddad, N. 1993. "Δωρικὰ κιονόκαρνα ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀραβησσοῦ", in *Ancient Macedonia*, v (Thessalonica) 539–57.
- Hadzisteliou-Price, T. 1973. "An Enigma in Pella: The Tholos and Herakles Phylakos", *AJA* 77: 66–71.
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1972. *A History of Macedonia*, i (Oxford).
- 1984. "The Battle of Pydna", *JHS* 104: 31–47 (= *Collected Studies*, iii (Amsterdam 1994) 377–93).
- and Griffith, G. T. 1979. *A History of Macedonia*, ii (Oxford).
- and Hatzopoulos, M. B. 1982. "The Via Egnatia in Western Macedonia I", *AJAH* 7: 128–49.
- Hatzopoulos, M. B. 1985. "La Béotie et la Macédoine à l'époque de l'hégémonie thébaine: le point de vue macédonien", in G. Argoud and P. Roesch (eds.), *La Béotie antique*, Lyon–Saint-Étienne 16–20 May 1983 (Paris) 247–57.
- 1987a. "Artémis Digaia Blaganitis en Macédoine", *BCH* 111: 397–412.

- Hatzopoulos, M. B. 1987b. "Strepsa. A Reconsideration or New Evidence on the Road System of Lower Macedonia", in Hatzopoulos, M. B. and Loukopoulou, L. *Two Studies in Ancient Macedonian Topography*. Meletemata 3: 21–60.
- 1990. "Χώρα και κώμες τῆς Βεροίας", in *Πόλις και χώρα στην Αρχαία Μακεδονία και Θράκη. Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη, Ἑλληνικογαλλικὲς Ἐρευνες* (Thessalonica) 57–68.
- 1991. *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis*, Meletemata 14 (Athens).
- 1994a. *Cultes et rites de passage en Macédoine*, Meletemata 19 (Athens).
- 1994b. "The Sanctuaries", in *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton and Athens) 106–09.
- 1995. "Ἡ λατρεία τῆς θεᾶς Μᾶς στὴν Ἐδεσσα", in *Ἡ Ἐδεσσα καὶ ἡ περιοχὴ τῆς. Ἱστορία καὶ πολιτισμός, Πρακτικὰ Ἀ' πανελληνίου ἐπιστημονικοῦ συμποσίου, Ἐδεσσα 4, 5 καὶ 6 Δεκεμβρίου 1992* (Edessa) 125–33.
- 1996a. "Aigéai: la localisation de la première capitale macédonienne", REG 109: 264–69.
- 1996b. *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings: a Historical and Epigraphic Study*, i–ii, Meletemata 22 (Athens).
- 2001. "Ἡ ἔκδοση τῶν ἐπιγραφῶν τῆς τρίτης μακεδονικῆς μερίδος: παρελθὸν καὶ μέλλον", in *Ἀ' Πανελλήνιο Συνέδριο Ἐπιγραφικῆς, Θεσσαλονίκη 22–23 Ὀκτωβρίου 1999* (Thessalonica) 157–70.
- (2003). "Herodotos (VIII.137–138), the Manumissions from Leukopetra and the Topography of the Middle Haliakmon Valley", in R. Parker (ed.), *Herodotus and his World* (Oxford) 203–18.
- and Psoma, S. 1999. "Cités de Grèce septentrionale portant le nom Dion", *Tekmeria* 4: 1–12.
- Knoepfler, D., and Marigo-Papadopoulou, V. 1990. "Deux sites pour Méthone en Macédoine", BCH 114: 639–68.
- Helly, B. (1973). *Gonnoi, i: La Cité et son histoire* (Amsterdam).
- Heuzey, L. 1860. *Le Mont Olympe et l'Acarnanie* (Paris).
- Kallipolitis, B. 1952. "Buste d'Olganos, héros éponyme d'un fleuve macédonien", *Mon Piot* 46: 86–91.
- Karadedos, G. 1986. "Τὸ ἐλληνιστικὸ θέατρο τοῦ Δίου", in *Ancient Macedonia*, iv (Thessalonica) 325–40.
- Karamitrou-Mentesidi, G. 1993. "Aiane", in R. Ginouvès (ed.), *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton and Athens) 29–32.
- 1994. "Aiane, city of Macedonia", in *Greek Civilisation: Macedonia, Kingdom of Alexander the Great* (Athens) 32–35.
- 1996a. *Αἰανή* (Athens).
- 1996b. "Αἰανή 1983–1997", AEMΘ 10 (1996) 23–40.
- and Vatali, M. 1997. "Πολύμυλος Κοζάνης", AEMΘ 11: 81–92.
- Knoepfler, D. 2001. *Eretria*, xi: *Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté* (Lausanne).
- Kottaridi, A. 2002. "Discovering Aegae, the Old Macedonian Capital", in M. Stamatopoulou and M. Yeroulanou (eds.), *Excavating Classical Culture: Recent Archaeological Discoveries* (Oxford) 83–90.
- Kotzias, N. 1948–49. "Αεΐβηθρα, Πίμπλεια, Πιερίς, ἡ πατρίς τοῦ Ὀρφέως", *ArchEph Chron.* 25–40 (for which see BE (1953) 105).
- Leake, W. M. 1835. *Travels in Northern Greece*, iii (London).
- Liampi, K. 1998. "The Coinage of King Derdas and the History of the Elimiotte Dynasty", in A. Burnett (ed.), *Coins of Macedonia and Rome: 22 Essays in Honour of Charles Hersh* (London) 5–11.
- Lilimpaki-Akamati, M. 1987. "Ἀνασκαφικὴ ἔρευνα στὴν περιοχὴ καναλιοῦ Πέλλας", AEMΘ 1: 137–45.
- 1990. "Ἴερὰ τῆς Πέλλας", in *Πόλις καὶ χώρα στὴν Αρχαία Μακεδονία καὶ Θράκη. Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη, Ἑλληνικογαλλικὲς Ἐρευνες* (Thessalonica) 195–203.
- 1991. "Ἀνασκαφικὴ ἔρευνα στὴν περιοχὴ τοῦ Καναλιοῦ τῆς Πέλλας κατὰ τὴν περίοδο 1988–1991", AEMΘ 5: 83–95.
- 1996. *Τὸ Θεσμοφόριο τῆς Πέλλας* (Athens).
- 2000. *Τὸ ἱερὸ τῆς Μητέρας τῶν Θεῶν καὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης στὴν Πέλλα* (Thessalonica).
- 2002. "Recent Discoveries in Pella", in M. Stamatopoulou and M. Yeroulanou (eds.), *Excavating Classical Culture: Recent Archaeological Discoveries* (Oxford) 83–90.
- Mackay, P. 1976. "Farangi", PECS 326.
- Mari, M. 2002. *Al di là Olimpo: Macedoni e grandi santuari della Grecia dall'età arcaica al primo ellenismo* (Athens).
- Megas, A. 1976. "Ἐλίμεια-Αἰανὴ στὸν Λίβιο", in *Ἀ' Συμπόσιο Ἱστορίας-Λαογραφίας-Γλωσσολογίας Δυτικομακεδονικοῦ χώρου* (Thessalonica) 13–18.
- Mikulčič, I. 1974. "Über die Größe der Spätantiken Städte in Makedonien", *ZivaAnt* 24: 191–212.
- Mitrevski, D. 1996. "Vardarski Rid", in *Arheološka Karta na Republika Makedonija*, ii (Skopje) 96–97.
- Oikonomos, G. P. 1915. *Ἐπιγραφαὶ τῆς Μακεδονίας* (Athens).
- Panayotou, A., and Chrysostomou, P. 1993. "Inscriptions de la Bottiée et de l'Almopie en Macédoine", BCH 117: 359–400.
- Pandermalis, D. 1977. "Λατρεῖες καὶ ἱερὰ τοῦ Δίου Πιερίας", in *Ancient Macedonia*, ii (Thessalonica) 331–42.
- 1993. "Dion", in R. Ginouvès (ed.), *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton and Athens) 96–101.
- 1999. *Δίον: Ἡ ἀνακάλυψη* (Athens).
- 2000. "Δίον 1998: Ἐκατόμβες καὶ Σωτήρια", AEMΘ 12: 291–98.
- 2002. "Δίον 2000", AEMΘ 14: 377–84.
- Papakonstantinou-Diamantourou, D. 1971. *Πέλλα, i: Ἱστορικὴ ἐπισκόπησις καὶ μαρτυρίαι* (Athens).
- Papazoglou, F. 1988. *Les Villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine*, BCH suppl. 16 (Athens).
- Perlman, P. 2000. *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece: The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese*, *Hypomnemata* 121 (Göttingen).

- Petkos, A. 1997. "Τὰ τείχη τῆς Βεροίας", in *Μνήμη Μανόλη Ανδρόνικου* (Thessalonica) 263–76.
- Petsas, P. M. 1961. "Ὡναὶ ἐκ τῆς Ἡμαθίας", *ArchEph* 1–57.
- 1966–67. "Χρονικά Ἀρχαιολογικά", *Makedonika* 7: 277–368.
- Phaklaris, P. 1996. "Βεργίνα: Ὁ ὀχυρωματικὸς περίβολος καὶ ἡ ἀκρόπολη", *AEMΘ* 10: 69–78.
- Piérart, M. 1988. "IG 1³ 281–282 et le phoros de Thrace", in D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque*, Actes du colloque de Neuchâtel en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux (Geneva) 309–21.
- Pingiatioglou, S. 1996. "Τὸ ἱερὸ τῆς Δήμητρας στὸ Δίον", *AEMΘ* 10: 225–32.
- Price, M., and Waggoner, N. 1975. *Archaic Greek Coinage: The Asyut Hoard* (London).
- Pritchett, W. K. 1991. *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography*, vii (Amsterdam).
- Psoma, S. 2001. *Olynthe et les Chalcidiens de Thrace* (Stuttgart).
- Rhomiopoulou, K. 1997. *Λευκάδια: ἀρχαία Μίεζα* (Athens).
- Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, C. 1987. "Εὐρυδικὰ Σίρρα Εὐκλείαι", in *Ἀμητός: Τιμητικὸς τόμος γιὰ τὸν καθηγητὴ Μανόλη Ανδρόνικο*, organised by M. Tiberios, S. Drogou and C. Saatsoglou-Paliadeli (Thessalonica) 733–45.
- 1996. "Τὸ ἱερὸ τῆς Εὐκλείας στὴ Βεργίνα", *AEMΘ* 10: 55–68.
- 2001. "The Palace of Vergina-Aegae and its Surroundings", in I. Nielsen (ed.), *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC: Regional Development and Cultural Interchange between East and West* (Athens) 201–13.
- Savvopoulou, T. 1988. *Εὐρωπός* (Europos).
- 1989. "Δοκιμαστικὲς ἔρευνες στὴν Εὐρωπὸ Κιλκίς", *AEMΘ* 3: 189–99.
- Schmidt, J. 1950. "Pimpleia", *RE* xx. 1387–89.
- Siganidou, M. 1987a. "Τὰ τείχη τῆς Πέλλας", in *Ἀμητός: Τιμητικὸς τόμος γιὰ τὸν καθηγητὴ Μανόλη Ανδρόνικου* (Thessalonica) 765–86.
- 1987b. "Τὸ ἀνακτορικὸ συγκρότημα τῆς Πέλλας", *AEMΘ* 1: 119–24.
- 1990. "Πολιοδομικὰ προβλήματα Πέλλας", in *Πόλις καὶ χώρα στὴν Ἀρχαία Μακεδονία καὶ Θράκη: Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη*, Ἑλληνογαλλικὲς ἔρευνες (Thessalonica) 167–74.
- 1996. "Die Basileia von Pella", in W. Hoepfner and G. Brands (eds.), *Basileia: die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige* (Mainz am Rhein) 144–47.
- and Trochides, K. 1990. "Ἡ σχολὴ τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους στὴ Μίεζα", *AEMΘ* 4: 121–25.
- Stephanidou-Tiberiou, T. 1988. "Περίβολος ἐν τετραγώνῳ σχήματι: Προβλήματα τῆς ἑλληνιστικῆς ὀχύρωσης τοῦ Δίου", *AEMΘ* 2: 153–60.
- 1998. *Ἀνασκαφὴ Δίου*, i: Ἡ ὀχύρωση (Thessalonica).
- Struck, A. 1902. "Inchriften aus Makedonien", *AM* 27: 305–20.
- Tataki, A. 1994. *Macedonian Edessa: Prosopography and Onomasticon, Meletemata* 18 (Athens).
- Tselekas, P. 1996. "The Coinage of Pydna", *NC* 156: 11–32.
- Vavritsas, A. K. 1977. "Ἐπιγραφὴ ἐξ Ἀραβησοῦ Πέλλης", in *Ancient Macedonia*, ii (Thessalonica) 7–11.
- Voutiras, E. 1993. "Ἡ λατρεία τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ στὴν ἀρχαία Μακεδονία", in *Ancient Macedonia*, v (Thessalonica) 251–65.

The speech of the ancient Macedonians, in the light of recent epigraphic discoveries

By Miltiades Hatzopoulos, VI International Symposium on Ancient Macedonia, 1999.

Modern discussion of the speech of the ancient Macedonians began in 1808, when F. G. Sturz published a small book entitled *De dialecto macedonica liber* (Leipzig 1808), intended to be a scientific enquiry into the position of Macedonian within Greek. However, after the publication of O. Müller's work *Über die Wohnsitz, die Abstammung und die ältere Geschichte des makedonischen Volks* (Berlin 1825), the discussion evolved into an acrimonious controversy -- initially scientific but soon political -- about the Greek or non-Greek nature of this tongue. Diverse theories were put forward:

I) Macedonian is a mixed language either of partly Illyrian origin -- such was the position of Müller himself, G. Kazaroff, M. Rostovtzeff, M. Budimir, H. Baric; or of partly Thracian origin, as it was maintained by D. Tzanoff.

II) Macedonian is a separate Indo-European language. This was the opinion of V. Pisani, I. Russu, G. Mihailov, P. Chantraine, I. Pudic, C. D. Buck, E. Schwyzer, V. Georgiev, W. W. Tarn and of O. Masson in his youth.

III) But according to most scholars Macedonian was a Greek dialect. This view has been expanded by F. G. Sturz, A. Fick, G. Hatzidakis, O. Hoffmann, F. Solmsen, V. Lesny, Andriotis, F. Geyer, N. G. L. Hammond, N. Kalleris, A. Toynbee, Ch. Edson and O. Masson in his mature years.

IV) Finally, a small number of scholars thought that the evidence available was not sufficient to form an opinion. Such was the view of A. Meillet and A. Momigliano.

Whatever the scientific merits of the above scholars, it was the nature of the evidence itself and, above all, its scarcity, which allowed the propounding of opinions so diverse and incompatible between themselves.

In fact, not one phrase of Macedonian, not one complete syntagm had come down to us in the literary tradition;

- because Macedonian, like many other Greek dialects, was never promoted to the dignity of a literary vehicle;
- because the Temenid kings, when they endowed their administration with a chancery worthy of the name, adopted the Attic *koine*, which in the middle of the fourth century was prevailing as the common administrative idiom around the shores of the Aegean basin.

Thus, the only available source for knowledge of Macedonian speech were the glosses, that is to say isolated words collected by lexicographers mainly from literary works because of their rarity or strangeness, and also personal names which, as we know, are formed from appellatives (Νικηφόρος < νίκη + φέρω).

The glosses, rare and strange words by definition, had the major defect of being liable to corruption, to alterations, in the course of transmission through the ages by copyists who could not recognise them.

As far as personal names are concerned, for want of scientific epigraphic corpora of the Macedonian regions, until very recently it was impossible to compile trustworthy lists.

On top of that, these two sources of information, far from leading to convergent conclusions, suggested conflicting orientations.

While the glosses included, besides words with a more or less clear Greek etymology (καρπαία· ὄρησις μακεδονική [cf. καρπός]· κύνουρες· ἄρκτοι· Μακεδόνες [cf. κύνωψ]· ῥάματα· βοτρυδία, σταφυλίσ· Μακεδόνες [cf. ῥάξ, gen. ῥαγός]), a significant number of terms hard to interpret as Greek (γόδα· ἔντερα· Μακεδόνες; γοτάν· ὕν· Μακεδόνες; σκοῖδος· ἀρχή τις παρὰ Μακεδόσι [Hesychius]), the vast majority of personal names, not only were perfectly Greek (Φίλιππος, Ἀλέξανδρος, Παρμενίων, Ἀντίπατρος, Ἀντίοχος, Ἀρσινόη, Εὐρυδίκη) but also presented original traits excluding the possibility of their being borrowed from the Attic dialect, which was the official idiom of the kingdom (Ἀμύντας, Μαχάτας, Ἀλκέτας, Λάατος), indeed from any other Greek dialect (Πτολεμαῖος, Κρατεύας, Βούπλατος).

Until very recently it was hard to tell which set of evidence was more trustworthy.

During the last thirty years the situation has radically changed thanks to the publication of the epigraphic corpora of Thessalonike (1972) and Northern Macedonia (1999) by the Berlin Academy and of Upper Macedonia (1985) and Beroia (1998) by the Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity (KERA). Meanwhile the latter centre has also published three important onomastic collections: of Beroia, of Edessa and of Macedonians attested outside their homeland.

This intense epigraphic activity fed by continuous archaeological discoveries has brought to light an abundance of documents, among which the first texts written in Macedonian. This new body of evidence renders to a large extent irrelevant the old controversies and requires an *ab initio* re-opening of the discussion on a different basis.

Old theories however, die hard and relics of obsolete erudition still encumber handbooks and scientific journals. I particularly have in mind R. A. Crossland's chapter in the second edition of volume III 1 of the Cambridge Ancient History and E. N. Borza's latest booklet *Before Alexander. Constructions of Early Macedonia* published respectively in 1982 and 1999.

One reason - perhaps the main one - for such resistance to the assimilation of new evidence and persistence of obsolete theories until these very last years is the way in which since the nineteenth century the scholarly discussion about Macedonian speech and its Greek or non-Greek character has focused on the sporadic presence in Macedonian glosses and proper names -- which otherwise looked perfectly Greek -- of the sign of the voiced stop (β, δ, γ) instead of the corresponding unvoiced, originally "aspirated" stop expected in Greek, as for instance in Βάλακρος and Βερενίκα instead of Φάλακρος and Φερενίκα.

Here I must open a parenthesis. The traditional English pronunciation of classical Greek presents an obstacle to the understanding of the problem. To make things simple, one may say that classical Greek originally possessed several series of occlusive consonants or stops, that is to say consonants obtained by the momentary occlusion of the respiratory ducts. These, according to the articulatory region, can be distinguished into labials, dentals and velars (the occlusion is respectively performed by the lips, the teeth or the velum of the palate) and, according to the articulatory mode, into unvoiced (/p/, /t/, /k/), voiced (/b/, /d/, /g/) and unvoiced "aspirates" - in fact "expirates", that is to say, accompanied by a breathing - (/ph/, /th/, /kh/). These "aspirates", in some dialects from the archaic period and in most by the Hellenistic age, had become spirants, that is to say they were no longer obtained by the complete occlusion of the respiratory ducts, but by their simple contraction and were accordingly pronounced as /f/, /θ/, /x/. At the same time the voiced stops also might, according to the phonetic context, lose their occlusion and become spirants pronounced /v/, /ð/, /γ/. In fact, the chronology of the passage from the "classical" to the "Hellenistic" pronunciation varied according to dialect and to region.

The occlusive consonants of Greek are the heirs of an Indo-European system which differed from the Greek one in that it possessed an additional series of occlusive consonants pronounced with both the lips and the velum. This series survived until the Mycenaean period, but was subsequently eliminated from all Greek dialects in various ways. Moreover, in the Indo-European system of consonants the place of the Greek series of unvoiced "aspirate" stops was occupied by a series of voiced "aspirate" stops, that is to say voiced stops accompanied by a breathing. These last ones (/bh/, /dh/, /gh/, /gwh/) survived to a large extent only in Sanskrit and in modern Indian dialects. Elsewhere, they either lost their breathing (such is the case of the Slavonic, Germanic, and Celtic languages), or their sonority (such is the case of the Greek and Italic languages, in which they evolved into (/ph/, /th/, /kh/, /khw/). Thus the root *bher-* is represented by the verb *bharami* in Sanskrit, *bero* in Old Slavonic, *baira* in Gothic, *berim* in ancient Irish, φέρω in Greek and *fero* in Latin.

The supporters of the non-Greek nature of Macedonian reasoned as follows: if, instead of the well known Greek personal names Φάλακρος ("the bald one") or Φερενίκη ("she who brings victory") with a *phi*, we read the names Βάλακρος or Βερενίκα with a *beta* on the inscriptions of Macedonia, this is because the Macedonian tongue has not participated in the same consonant mutations as prehistoric Greek -- already before the first Mycenaean documents in Linear B -- which had transformed the "aspirate" voiced stops of Indo-European (/bh/, /dh/, /gh/) into "aspirate" unvoiced stops (/ph/, /th/, /kh/). That is to say that, instead of the loss of sonority of Greek, in Macedonian we are dealing with the loss of "aspiration" in Macedonian, which classifies the latter along with the Slavonic, the Germanic and the Celtic languages.

But, if Macedonian was separated from Greek before the second millennium B.C., it cannot be considered a Greek dialect, even an aberrant one.

What the partisans of such theories have not always explicitly stated is that they all rely on the postulate that the sounds rendered by the signs β, δ, γ in Macedonian glosses and proper names are the direct heirs of the series of voiced "aspirate" stops of Indo-European and do not result from a secondary sonorisation, *within Greek*, of the series represented by the signs φ, θ, χ. However, one must be wary of short-cuts and simplifications in linguistics. For instance, the sound /t/ in

the German word "Mutter" is not the direct heir of the same sound in the Indo-European word **mater*, but has evolved from the common Germanic form **moðer*, which was the reflex of Indo-European **mater*.

The example of Latin demonstrates that the evolution /bh/ > /ph/ > /f/ > /v/ > /b/, envisaged above, is perfectly possible. Thus, the form *albus* ("white") in Latin does not come directly from Indo-European **albhos*. In fact the stem *albh-* became first *alph-* and then *alf-* in Italic, and it was only secondarily that the resulting spirant sonorised into *alv-* which evolved into *alb-* in Latin (cf. *alfu=albos* in Umbrian and ἄλφους· λευκούς in Greek).

G. Hatzidakis (see especially *Zur Abstammung der alten Makedonier* [Athens 1897] 35-37) was the first - and for many years the only one - to stress the importance -- and at the same time the weakness -- of the implicit postulate of the partisans of the non-Greek character of Macedonian, to wit the alleged direct descent of the series represented by the signs of the voiced stops in the Macedonian glosses and personal names from the Indo-European series of "aspirate" voiced stops.

Since the middle of the eighties of the last century the acceleration of archaeological research in Macedonia and also the activities of the Macedonian Programme of the Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity (KERA) mentioned above have occasioned numerous scholarly works exploiting the new evidence has been collected and allows us to go beyond the Gordian knot which since the nineteenth century had kept captive all discussion about the tongue of the ancient Macedonians (Cl. Brixhe, Anna Panayotou, O. Masson, L. Dubois, M. B. Hatzopoulos). It would not be an exaggeration to say that henceforward the obstacle hindering the identification of the language spoken by Philip and Alexander has been removed: ancient Macedonian, as we shall see, was really and truly a Greek dialect. On this point all linguists or philologists actively dealing with the problem are of the same opinion. It is equally true that they do not agree on everything. Two questions still raise serious contention:

a) How should be explained this sporadic presence in Macedonian glosses and proper names of the signs of voiced stops (β, δ, γ) instead of the corresponding originally "aspirate" unvoiced ones (φ, θ, χ) of the other Greek dialects?

b) What is the dialectal position of Macedonian within Greek?

The first question has been tackled several times in recent years, but with divergent conclusions by Cl. Brixhe and Anna Panayotou on the one hand and O. Masson, L. Dubois and the present speaker on the other.

On the question of the dialectal affinities of Macedonian within Greek, besides the above mentioned scholars, N. G. L. Hammond and E. Voutiras have also made significant contributions. As far as I am concerned I have been gradually convinced that the two questions are intimately linked, or rather, that the search for the affinities of the Macedonian dialect can provide a satisfactory explanation of this controversial particularity of its consonantal system.

A problematic mutation

Down to very recent years discussion on the topic on the Macedonian consonantal system was almost exclusively dependent on literary evidence.

The systematic collection of inscriptions from Macedonia in the Epigraphic Archive of KERA occasioned the publication of three articles exploiting this epigraphic material, the first two in 1987 and the third in 1988.

The first one, written by the present speaker had its starting point in a series of manumissions by consecration to Artemis from the territory of Aigeai (modern Vergina), who was qualified as Διγαία and Βλαγαν(ε)ῖτις, the latter derived from the place name at which she was venerated (ἐν Βλαγάνοις).

It was obvious to me that the first epiclesis was nothing else than the local form of the adjective δίκαιος, δικαία, δίκαιον ("the just one").

As for the explanation of the less obvious epiclesis Blaganitis and of the place name Blaganoi, the clue was provided by Hesychius' gloss Βλαχάν ὁ Βάτραχος, which I connected with one of the manumission texts qualifying Artemis as the goddess [τῶν Β]ατράχων.

The two epicleseis of Artemis demonstrated that Macedonian might occasionally present voiced consonants - in the case in hand represented by the letter *gamma* – not only instead of unvoiced "aspirates" (in this case represented by the letter *chi* of Βλαχάν) but also instead of simple unvoiced stops (in this case represented by the letter *kappa* of Δικαία).

This discovery had important implications, because it showed that the phenomenon under examination, of which I collected numerous examples, had nothing to do with a consonant mutation going back to Indo-European, which could concern only the voiced "aspirates" and would make a separate language of Macedonian, different from the other Greek dialects. In fact, it ought to be interpreted as a secondary and relatively recent change within Greek, which had only partially run its course, as becomes apparent from the coexistence of forms with voiced as well as unvoiced consonants also in the case of the simple unvoiced stop (cf. Κλεοπάτρα-Γλευπάτρα, Βάλακρος-Βάλαγρος, Κερτίμμας-Κερδίμμας, Κυδίας-Γυδίας, Κραστωνία-Γραστωνία, Γορτυνία-Γορδυνία), but also from the presence of "hypercorrect" forms (cf. ὑπρισθῆναι=ὑβρισθῆναι, κλυκυτάτη=γλυκυτάτη, τάκρυν=δάκρυν).

This tendency to voice the unvoiced consonants was undoubtedly impeded after the introduction of Attic *koine* as the administrative language of the Macedonian state and only accidentally and sporadically left traces in the written records, especially in the case of local terms and proper names which had no correspondents and, consequently, no model in the official idiom.

In the second article published the same year I collected examples of forms with voiced and unvoiced sounds inherited from Indo-European voiced "aspirates" and was able to identify the complete series of feminine proper names with a voiced labial formed on the stem of φίλος: Βίλα, Βιλίστα, Βιλιστική parallel to Φίλα, Φιλίστα, Φιλιστική.

These names presenting a voiced consonant, rendered by a *beta*, formed according to the rules of Greek, and the Greek etymology of which was beyond doubt, convinced me that the explanation of the phenomenon should be sought within that language.

The third article, written jointly by Cl. Brixhe and Anna Panayotou, who was then preparing a thesis on the Greek language of the inscriptions found in Macedonia on the basis of the epigraphic documentation collected at KERA, followed another orientation.

- Whereas new evidence did not leave them in any doubt that the Macedonian of historical times spoken by Philip II and Alexander the Great was a Greek dialect, they contended that, besides this Macedonian, there had formerly existed another language in which the Indo-European "aspirates" had become voiced stops and that this language had provided the proper names and the appellatives presenting voiced stops instead of the unvoiced stops of Greek, for instance Βερενίκα and Βάλακρος instead of Φερενίκα and Φάλακρος.

These ideas were later developed and completed in a chapter devoted to Macedonian and published in a collective volume. In this paper Cl. Brixhe and Anna Panayotou identified this other language that according to them had disappeared before the end of the fifth century B.C., not before playing "a not insignificant part in the genesis of the Macedonian entity", with the language of the Brygians or Phrygians of Europe.

Such was the beginning of a long controversy in the form of articles, communications to congresses and also private correspondence, which, as far as I am concerned, was particularly enriching, because it gave me the opportunity to refine my arguments.

Their objection, at first sight reasonable, to wit that a form such as Βερενίκα cannot be the product of the voicing of the first phoneme of Φερενίκα, for the "aspirate" stop /ph/ has no voiced correspondent in Greek, obliged me to examine their postulate on the conservative character of the pronunciation of the consonants and, in a more general way, of the Attic *koine* spoken in Macedonia.

With the help of documents such as the deeds of sale from Amphipolis and the Chalkidike and of the boundary ordinance from Mygdonia, I was able to show that by the middle of the fourth century in Northern Greece

- the ancient "aspirate" stops written with the help of the signs φ, θ, χ had already lost their occlusion and had become spirants, that is to say they were formed by the simple contraction instead of the complete occlusion of the respiratory ducts;

- the ancient voiced stops written with the help of the signs β, δ, γ were pronounced, without any phonological significance, as spirants as well as stops, according to the phonetic context, just like in modern Castilian (άνδρες-πόδες; cf. andar-querido).

This contention is proved by "errors" such as Βεφαίως in a mid-fourth century B.C. deed of sale from Amphipolis, which cannot be explained unless *phi*, pronounced like an *f*, indicated the unvoiced correspondent of the phoneme pronounced like a *v* and written with the help of the letter *beta*.

On the other hand, I drew attention to a series of allegedly "Brygian" terms - since they are found in Macedonian proper names presenting voiced consonants as reflexes of Indo-European voiced "aspirates" - which, however, showed a suspicious likeness with Greek words not only in their stems, but also in their

derivation and composition. Thus, if we accept the Brygian theory, the name of the fifth Macedonian month Ξανδικός presupposes the existence of a Brygian adjectif *xandos* parallel to Greek ξανθός; likewise the Macedonian personal name Γαιτέας a Brygian substantive *gaita* (mane) parallel to Greek χαίτα (χαίτη); the Macedonian personal name Βουλομάγα a Brygian substantive *maga* parallel to Greek μάχα (μάχη); the Macedonian personal name Σταδμέας a Brygian substantive *stadmos* parallel to Greek σταθμός; the Macedonian personal names Βίλος, Βίλα, Βίλιστος, Βιλίστα a Brygian stem *bil-* parallel to Greek *phil-* and also Brygian rules of derivation identical to the Greek ones responsible for the formation of the superlative φίλιστος, φιλίστα (φιλίστη) and of the corresponding personal names Φίλιστος, Φιλίστα (Φιλίστη); the compound Macedonian personal names Βερενίκα and Βουλομάγα not only the Brygian substantives *nika*, *bulon*, *maga* and the verb *bero* parallel to Greek νίκα, φῦλον, μάχα, φέρω, but on top of that rules of composition identical to the Greek ones responsible for the formation of the corresponding Greek personal names Φερενίκα and Φυλομάχη.

However, the Brygian language reconstituted in this manner is not credible, for it looks suspiciously like Greek in disguise.

Finally, a series of observations 1) on the names of the Macedonian months, 2) on the use of the patronymic adjective, and 3) on a neglected piece of evidence for the Macedonian speech, induced me to reconsider the connexion between Macedonian and the Thessalian dialects.

1) The Macedonian calendar plays a significant role in the Brygian theory, because according to the latter's supporters it testified the "undeniable cultural influence" of the Phrygian people in the formation of the Macedonian *ethnos*. They particularly refer to the months Audnaios, Xandikos, Gorpaios and Hyperberetaios, which according to them can find no explanation in Greek.

- In fact, the different variants of the first month (Αύδωναῖος, Αύδυναῖος, Αύδναῖος, Ἄιδωναῖος) leave no doubt that the original form is Ἄφιδωναῖος, which derives from the name of Hades, "the invisible" (*a-wid-*) and followed two different evolutions: on the one hand Ἄφιδωναῖος>Αύδωναῖος>Αύδυναῖος>Αύδναῖος, with the disappearance of the closed vowel /i/ and the vocalisation of the semi-vowel /w/ and, later, with the closing of the long vowel /o:/ into /u/ (written -u-) and finally with the disappearance of this closed vowel, and, on the other hand Ἄφιδωναῖος> Ἄιδωναῖος, with the simple loss of intervocalic /w/.

- The case of Xandikos is even clearer. It was felt as a simple dialectal variant within the Greek language, as is apparent from the form Ξανθικός attested both in literary texts and in inscriptions.

- Concerning Γορπιαῖος, Hofmann had already realised that it should be connected with καρπός, the word for fruit in Greek, which makes good sense for a month corresponding roughly to August (cf. the revolutionary month Fructidor). This intuition is confirmed today, on the one hand by the cult of Dionysos Κάρπιος attested in neighbouring Thessaly and, on the other hand, by the variant Γαρπιαῖος showing that we are dealing with a sonorisation of the unvoiced initial consonant, a banal phenomenon in Macedonia, and a double treatment of the semi-vowel /r/, of which there are other examples from both Macedonia and Thessaly.

- The name of the twelfth month Ὑπερβερεταῖος, the Greek etymology of which was put in doubt, orientates us too in the direction of Thessaly. In fact it is inseparable from the cult of Zeus Περφερέτας also attested in nearby Thessaly.

2) At the exhibition organised at Thessalonike in 1997 and entitled Ἐπιγραφές τῆς Μακεδονίας was presented an elegant funerary monument from the territory of Thessalonike of the first half of the third century B.C. bearing the inscription Πισταρέτα Θρασίπεια κόρα.

- Κόρα as a dialectal form of Attic κόρη is also known from other inscriptions found in Macedonia. As for the use of the patronymic adjective instead of the genitive as a mark of filiation (Ἀλέξανδρος Φιλίππειος instead of Ἀλέξανδρος Φιλίππου), which is characteristic of Thessalian and more generally of the "Aeolic" dialects, it had been postulated by O. Hoffmann on the basis of names of cities founded by the Macedonians, such as Ἀλεξάνδρεια, Ἀντιγόνεια, Ἀντιόχεια, Σελεύκεια. Now it was for the first time directly attested in a text which could be qualified as dialectal.

- The confirmation that the patronymic adjective constitutes a local Macedonian characteristic and that the monument of Pistareta could not be dismissed as set up by some immigrant Thessalians was provided by a third century B.C. manumission from Beroia, which, although written in Attic *koine*, refers to the daughter of a certain Agelaos as τὴν θυγατέρα τὴν Ἀγελαίαν.

3) Finally, although it had been known for centuries, recent studies have ignored the sole direct attestation of Macedonian speech preserved in an ancient author. It is a verse in a non-Attic dialect that the fourth century Athenian poet Strattis in his comedy *The Macedonians* (Athen. VII, 323b) puts in the mouth of a character, presumably Macedonian, as an answer to the question of an Athenian ἡ σφύραινα δ' ἐστὶ τίς; ("The sphyraena, what's that?"): κέστραν μὲν ὕμμες, ὠτικκοί, κικλήσκετε ("It's what ye in Attica dub cestra").

Thus research on the Macedonian consonantal system has led to the question of the dialectal affinities of this speech, to which it is closely connected.

It was natural that the major controversy about the Greek or non-Greek character of Macedonian had relegated to a secondary position the question of its position within the Greek dialects. Nevertheless it had not suppressed it completely.

Already F. G. Sturz, following Herodotos, considered Macedonian a Doric dialect, whereas O. Abel was even more precise and placed it among the northern Doric dialects. He thought that Strabo and Plutarch provided the necessary arguments for maintaining that Macedonian did not differ from Epirote.

It was the fundamental work of O. Hoffmann that forcibly introduced the Aeolic thesis into the discussion, which is largely accepted in our days (Daskalakis, Toynbee, Goukowsky).

The Doric-north-western thesis made a strong come-back thanks to the authority of J. N. Kalleris followed by G. Babiniotis, O. Masson and other scholars with more delicately shaded opinions (A. Tsopanakis, A. I. Thavoris, M. B. Sakellariou and Brixhe).

Finally, N. G. L. Hammond held a more original position, arguing for the parallel existence of two Macedonian dialects: one in Upper Macedonia close to the north-western dialects and another in Lower Macedonia close to Thessalian.

But a new piece of evidence, the publication of a lengthy dialectal text from Macedonia, created a new situation. It is a curse tablet from Pella dating from the first half of the fourth century B.C. which was discovered in a grave at Pella.

[Θετί]μας καὶ Διονυσοφῶντος τὸ τέλος καὶ τὸν γάμον καταγράφω καὶ τῶν ἄλλῶν πασῶν γυ-

[ναικ]ῶν καὶ κηρῶν καὶ παρθένων, μάλιστα δὲ Θετίμας, καὶ παρκαττίθεμαι Μάκρωνι καὶ

[τοῖς] δαίμοσι· καὶ ὅποκα ἐγὼ ταῦτα διελέξαμι καὶ ἀναγνοίην πάλιν ἀνορόξασα,

[τόκα] γᾶμαι Διονυσοφῶντα, πρότερον δὲ μή· μή γὰρ λάβοι ἄλλαν γυναῖκα ἀλλ' ἢ ἐμέ,

[ἐμέ δ]ὲ συνκαταγηρᾶσαι Διονυσοφῶντι καὶ μηδεμίαν ἄλλαν. Ἴκέτις ὑμῶ(ν) γίνο-

[μαι· Φίλ?]αν οἰκτίρετε, δαίμονες φίλ[ο]ι, δαρινὰ γάρ

ἴμε φίλων πάντων καὶ ἐρήμα· ἀλλὰ

[ταῦτ]α φυλάσσετε ἐμὶν ὅπως μὴ γίνηται τα[ῦ]τα καὶ

κακὰ κακῶς Θετίμα ἀπόληται.

[----]ΑΛ[----]ΥΝΜ. ΕΣΠΛΗΝ ἐμός, ἐμέ δὲ [ε]ύ[δ]αίμονα καὶ μακαρίαν γενέσται

[-----] ΤΟ[.] [----] [..] ..Ε.Ε.ΕΩ[]Α.[.]Ε. ΜΕΓΕ[---]

“Of Thetima and Dinysofion the ritual wedding and the marriage I bind by a written spell, as well as (the marriage) of all other women (to him), both widows and maidens, but above all of Thetima; and I entrust (this spell) to Macron and the *daimones*. And were I ever to unfold and read these words again after digging (the tablet) up, only then should Dionysophon marry, not before; may he indeed not take another woman than myself, but let me alone grow old by the side of Dionysophon and no one else. I implore you: have pity for [Phila?], dear *daimones*, for I am indeed downcast and bereft of friends. But please keep this (piece of writing) for my sake so that these events do not happen and wretched Thetima perishes miserably. [---] but let me become happy and blessed. [---]” (translation by E. Voutiras, modified).

E. Voutiras, the editor of the tablet from Pella, was well aware of the linguistic traits that his text shared with the north-western Greek dialects: in particular the conservation of the long /a/ (or of its reflex: ἄλλαν), the contraction of /a/ and /o/ (short or long) into a long /a/ (or its reflex: ἀλλᾶν), the dative of the first person singular of the personal pronoun ἐμίν, the presence of temporal adverbs ending in -κα (ὅποκα), the apocope of verbal prefixes (παρκαττίθεμαι), the dissimilation of consecutive spirants which betrays the use of the signs -στ- instead

of -σθ-; but, on the other hand, he ignored, as if they were simple errors, the dialectal traits which did not conform to the purely north-western idea that he had of the dialect. These, as L. Dubois and I have pointed out, are in particular the forms διελέξαιμι, ἰμέ, ἀνορόξασσα, δαπινά instead of διελίξαιμι, εἰμί, ἀνορύξασσα, ταπεινά, which bear witness to phonetic phenomena having, in the first three cases, their correspondents both in dialectal Thessalian texts and in *koine* texts from Macedonia, whereas the fourth case presents the voicing of the unvoiced typical of the Macedonian dialect.

Cl. Brixhe returned to this text with a thorough analysis which confirmed and refined those of his predecessors. He pointed out the treatment of the group -sm-, with the elimination of the sibilant and the compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel, which is proper to north-western dialects but not Thessalian, the presence of the particle -κα, expected in the north-western dialects as opposed to Thessalian -κε, and the athematic form of the dative plural δαίμοσι, attested in the north-western dialects but not in Thessalian, where one would expect δαιμόνεσσι; he interpreted the graphic hesitation E/I, O/Y (pronounced /u/) as resulting "from a tendency, in the Macedonian dialect and, later, in the *koine* of the region towards a closing of the *vocales mediae* e and o, respectively becoming i and u", which indicated an affinity of Macedonian not with the north-western dialects but with Attic and even more with Boeotian and Thessalian and with the northern dialects of modern Greek; he adopted L. Dubois' interpretation of δαπινά and admitted that the spirantisation of the "aspirates" and the voiced stops in Macedonian had already taken place in the classical period, but persisted in considering "more efficient" his interpretation of forms such as Βερενίκα as "Brygian" rather than Greek.

In my opinion the presence of forms such as διελέξαιμι, ἰμέ, ἀνορόξασσα, δαπινά, expected in Macedonia but alien to the north-western dialects, is a decisive confirmation of the local origin of the author of the text and allows the elimination of the unlikely hypothesis that it might have been the work of an Epirote resident alien living in Pella. But this is not all. The fact that the closing of the *vocales mediae*, of which the first three examples bear witness, is a phenomenon well attested in Thessalian confirms the coexistence of north-western and of Thessalian characteristics in Macedonian; it indicates the intermediate position of the latter dialect, and legitimises the attempt to verify whether the tendency to voice the unvoiced consonants was not shared with at least some Thessalian dialects.

Kalleris had already pointed out that the place names Βοίβη and Βοιβηίς and the personal names Δρεβέλαος and Βερέκκας, which were attested in Thessaly but were unknown in Macedonia, respectively corresponded to Φοίβη, Φοιβηίς, Τρεφέλεως and to a composite name, the first element of which was Φερε-. Nevertheless he did not draw the conclusion that the sonorisation phenomenon, far from being limited to Macedonia, was common to that area and to Thessaly, because he refused to admit its localisation in Macedonia and in nearby areas, as P. Kretschmer had suggested.

In previous papers I had added to these place names a third one, Ὀττώλοβος (Ὀκτώλοφος), and a series of personal names either unknown (then) in Macedonia: Βουλονόα (Φυλονόα) or attested in a different form: Σταδμείας (Σταθμείας), Παντορδάνας (Παντορθάνας). The publication of fascicule III.B of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, which contains the onomastic material from Thessaly makes it now possible to add additional examples: Ἀμβίλογος, Βύλιππος, Βῦλος

corresponding to Ἀμφίλοχος, Φύλιππος, Φῦλος, in the same manner that Βουλομάγα and Βουλονόα correspond to Φυλομάχη and Φυλονόη. Moreover, the frequent attestation of Κέββας in Thessaly does not allow us to consider it as an onomastic loan from Macedonia, where this personal name is attested only once.

Is it now possible to separate this hypocoristic from the family of personal names well represented in Thessaly and derived from the Greek appellative κεφαλή, one of which, namely Κεφαλῖνος, appears in Macedonia as Κεβαλῖνος? And if the purely Thessalian Ἀμβίλογος, Βύλιππος, Βῦλος, Βερέκκας or the both Thessalian and Macedonian Βουλομάγα, Βουλονόα, Κέββας find a perfect explication in Greek, what need is there to solicit the Phrygian language in order to explain the Macedonian form Βερενίκα, which is attested in Thessaly as Φερενίκα, since its case is strictly analogous to that of Κεβαλῖνος/Κεφαλῖνος?

If we now consider the geographic distribution of the forms with voiced consonants in Thessaly, we observe that they are concentrated in the northern part of the country, essentially in Pelasgiotis and Perrhaibia, with the greater concentration in the latter region. But in Macedonia also these forms are unequally distributed. They are to be found in significant numbers and variety - bearing witness to the authentic vitality of the phenomenon - in three cities or regions: Aigeai, Beroia and Pieria. Now all these three are situated in the extreme south-east of the country, in direct contact with Perrhaibia. I think that this geographical distribution provides the solution to the problem. We are dealing with a phonetic particularity of the Greek dialect spoken on either side of Mount Olympus, undoubtedly due to a substratum or an adstratum, possibly but not necessarily, Phrygian. If there remained any doubts regarding the Greek origin of the phenomenon, two personal names: Κεβαλῖνος and Βέτταλος should dispel it. It is well known that the first comes from the Indo-European stem **ghebh(e)l-*. If, according to the "Brygian" hypothesis, the loss of sonority of the "aspirates" had not taken place before the dissimilation of the breathings, the form that the Greek dialect of Macedonia would have inherited would have been Γεβαλῖνος and not Κεβαλῖνος, which is the result *first* of the loss of sonority of the "aspirates" and *then* of their dissimilation. Cf. Brixhe and Anna Panayotou, fully aware of the problem, elude it by supposing a "faux dialectisme". Βέτταλος, on the other hand, is obviously a Macedonian form of the ethnic Θετταλός used as a personal name with a probable transfer of the accent. We also know that the opposition between Attic Θετταλός and Boeotian Φετταλός requires an initial **gwhe-*. Given, on the one hand, that in Phrygian, contrary to Greek, the Indo-European labiovelars lost their velar appendix without conserving any trace thereof, the form that the Greek dialect of Macedonia should have inherited according to the "Brygian" hypothesis would have an initial *Γε-, which manifestly is not the case. On the other hand, the form Βέτταλος, which the Macedonians pronounced with a voiced initial consonant, is to be explained by a form of the continental Aeolic dialects, in which, as we know, the "aspirate" labiovelars followed by an /i/ or an /e/ became simple voiced labials. The Aeolic form Φετταλός, lying behind Βετταλός, provides us with a *terminus post quem* for the voicing phenomenon. For, if we take into consideration the spelling of the Mycenaean tablets, which still preserve a distinct series of signs for the labiovelars, it is necessary to date this phenomenon at a post-Mycenaean period, well after the elimination of the labio-velars, that is to say at the end of the second millennium B.C. at the earliest, and obviously within the Greek world. It is manifest that in the case of Βέτταλος an *ad hoc* hypothesis of a "faux dialectisme" is inadmissible, for at the late date at which a hypothetical Macedonian patriot might have been tempted to resort to such a form the Thessalian ethnic had long since been replaced by the Attic *koine* form Θετταλός. Its remodelling into a more

“Macedonian-sounding” Βετταλός would have demanded a level of linguistic scholarship attained only in the nineteenth century A.D.

Historical Interpretation

According to Macedonian tradition the original nucleus of the Temenid kingdom was the principality of Lebaia, whence, after crossing Illyria and Upper Macedonia, issued the three Argive brothers, Gauanes, Aeropos and Perdikkas, as they moved to conquer first the region of Beroia, then Aigeai and finally the rest of Macedonia.

It is highly probable that the royal Argive ancestry was a legend invented in order to create a distance and a hierarchy between common Macedonians and a foreign dynasty allegedly of divine descent. Might this legend nevertheless not retain, some authentic historical reminiscence?

In a previous paper, first read at Oxford some years ago, I attempted to show that Lebaia was a real place in the middle Haliakmon valley near the modern town of Velvendos, a region the economy of which was until very recently based on transhumant pastoralism. It is a likely hypothesis that during the Geometric and the Archaic period too the inhabitants of this region made their living tending their flocks between the mountain masses of Olympus and the Pierians and the plains of Thessaly, Pieria and Emathia, until under a new dynasty they took the decisive step of permanently settling on the fringe of the great Macedonian plain, at Aigeai.

What were the ethnic affinities of these transhumant shepherds? A fragment of the Hesiodic catalogue preserves a tradition according to which Makedon and Magnes were the sons of Zeus and of Thyia, Deukalion's daughter, and lived around Pieria and Mount Olympus. The Magnetes, of whom Magnes was the eponymous hero, were one of the two major perioikic *ethne* of northern Thessaly, who originally spoke an Aeolic dialect.

The other one was the Perrhaibians. Although they were not mentioned in the Hesiodic fragment, we know by Strabo that even at a much later period they continued to practice transhumant pastoralism. Their close affinity with the Macedonians is evident not only from onomastic data, but also from their calendar. Half of the Perrhaibian months the names of which we know figure also in the Macedonian calendar. Thus, it is no coincidence that Hellenikos presents Makedon as the son of Aiolos.

The above data outline a vast area between the middle Peneios and the middle Haliakmon valleys, which in prehistoric times was haunted by groups of transhumant pastoralists who spoke closely related Greek dialects. Is it unreasonable to think that, just as in modern times the Vlachs of Vlacholivado, who frequented precisely the same regions, spoke, under the influence of the Greek adstratum, a peculiar neo-Latin dialect, their prehistoric predecessors had done the same (undoubtedly under the influence of another adstratum which remains to be defined) and that the tendency to voice the unvoiced consonants was one of these peculiarities?

As to the three Temenid brothers, according to Herodotos mythical founders of the Macedonian kingdom, already in antiquity there was a suspicion that they had not come from Peloponnesian Argos but from Argos Orestikon in Upper Macedonia, hence the name Argeadai given not only to the reigning dynasty but to the whole

clan which had followed the three brothers in the adventure of the conquest of Lower Macedonia. Knowing that the Orestai belonged to the Molossian group, it is readily understandable how the prestigious elite of the new kingdom imposed its speech, and relegated to the status of a substratum patois the old Aeolic dialect, some traits of which, such as the tendency of closing the *vocales mediae* and the voicing of unvoiced consonants survived only in the form of traces, generally repressed, with the exception of certain place names, personal names and month names consecrated by tradition.

Select Bibliography

G. Babinotis, " Ancient Macedonia : the Place of Macedonian among the Greek Dialects ", *Glossologia* 7-8 (1988-1989) 53-69.

- " The Question of Mediae in Ancient Macedonian Greek Reconsidered ", *Historical Philology : Greek, Latin and Romance* (" Current Issues in Linguistic Theory " 87; Amsterdam-Philadelphia 1992) 30-33.

Cl. Brixhe, " Un nouveau champ de la dialectologie grecque : le macédonien ", *KATA DIALEKTON, Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale di Dialettologia Greca. A.I.O.N.* 19 (1997) 41-71.

Cl. Brixhe - Anna Panayotou, " L'atticisation de la Macédoine : l'une des sources de la koinè ", *Verbum* 11 (1988) 256.

- " Le macédonien ", *Langues indo-européennes* (Paris 1994) 206-220.

R. A. Crossland, "The Language of the Macedonians", *Cambridge Ancient History* III, 1 (1982) 843-47.

L. Dubois, " Une tablette de malédiction de Pella : s'agit-il du premier texte macédonien ? ", *REG* 108 (1995) 190-97.

M. B. Hatzopoulos, " Artémis, Digaia Blaganitis en Macédoine ", *BCH* 111 (1987) 398-412.

- " Le macédonien : nouvelles données et théories nouvelles ", *Ἀρχαία Μακεδονία* VI (Thessalonique 1999) 225-39.

- " L'histoire par les noms in Macedonia ", *Greek Personal Names. Proceedings of the British Academy* 104 (2000) 115-17.

- "La position dialectale du macédonien à la lumière des découvertes épigraphiques récentes", (J. Hagnal ed.) *Die altgriechischen Dialekte. Wesen und Werden* (Innsbruck 2007) 157-76.

O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen. Ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum* (Göttingen 1906).

J. N. Kalléris, *Les anciens Macédoniens*, v. I-II (Athens 1954-1976).

O. Masson, " Macedonian Language ", *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford-New York 1996) 905-906.

- " Noms macédoniens ", *ZPE* 123 (1998) 117-20.

Em. Voutiras, *Διονυσοφῶντοςγάμοι* (Amsterdam 1998) 20-34.

Source: <http://macedonia-evidence.org/macedonian-tongue.html>

FOR FAIR USE ONLY

‘L’histoire par les noms’ in Macedonia

MILTIADES HATZOPOULOS

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS AGO L. ROBERT DECLARED: ‘Nous devons faire non point des catalogues de noms, mais *l’histoire des noms*, et même *l’histoire par les noms*’. Brilliant as it is, this programmatic declaration needs, in my opinion, slight emendation if it is to be realistic: ‘Nous ne devons point faire que des catalogues de noms, mais aussi *l’histoire des noms*, et même *l’histoire par les noms*’.¹ In fact, before writing the history of names and even more before writing history through names, we must go through the less exciting—some would say the more tedious—work of collecting them. Robert had his notes, his cards, and, above all, his incomparable memory. We, by contrast, had until very recently only the 1959 reprint of the 1911 re-publication of W. Pape’s *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, first published in 1842 and considerably augmented by G. E. Benseler and son in 1862 and 1870, which contains much dubious or obsolete information; and F. Bechtel’s eighty-year-old *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, a more reliable book than Pape-Benseler but at the same time more limited in scope. This is no longer the case. Thanks to the indefatigable efforts of Peter Fraser and Elaine Matthews, we now have at our disposal—despite Robert’s scepticism²—the first three volumes of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* covering the whole of Greece proper with the exception of Macedonia, and offering the most up-to-date and reliable catalogue of Greek anthroponyms. Other regions will follow.

¹ L. Robert, ‘Eulaios, histoire et onomastique’, *Epist. Epeteris Philos. Schol. Panep. Athens* 13 (1962/3), 529 = *OMS* 2, 987; cf. ‘Discours d’ouverture’, *Actes du VII^e congrès international d’épigraphie grecque et latine* (Bucharest and Paris, 1979), 34 = *OMS* 6, 686.

² Robert, *OMS* 6, 32.

The Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity of the National Hellenic Research Foundation, particularly through the work of my colleague Argyro Tataki, has collaborated in the preparation of the Macedonian section. Taking advantage of the groundwork achieved so far, and anticipating *LGP*IV, I shall try to illustrate how the collection of the Macedonian onomastic material has made it possible to recover whole chapters of history long since lost, or even never written.

Robert claimed that detailed and well-informed study of Macedonian names would enable us to understand how these names spread in the Greek East, and to identify the centres of Macedonian colonization, which was no less significant a movement than the colonization of the archaic period.³ In the present paper, with the help of names, I shall attempt a foray into earlier chapters of Greek history, namely those which witnessed the foundation of the Macedonian Kingdom and its expansion into the whole of northern Greece.

I must first stress that in this endeavour I have been preceded by Fanoula Papazoglou, who in a little-known article—for it was published in 1977 in Serbian and in a Yugoslav periodical of restricted circulation—attempted to analyse the ethnic structure of ancient Macedonia in the light of recent onomastic research.⁴ The main results of her study were incorporated in her report, in French, to the international congress of Greek and Latin epigraphy held that same year in Constanza.⁵ The ambitions reflected in the titles of these contributions went beyond what could realistically be achieved with the evidence then available. At that time the author could use only three up-to-date collections of material: J. Touratsoglou's communication to the *Semaines Philippopolitaines*, 'Anthroponymie thrace en Macédoine occidentale',⁶ the indexes of C. Edson's edition of the volume of *Inscriptiones Graecae* containing the inscriptions of Thessalonike;⁷ and G. Bakalakis' communication to a Thracology congress, 'Thrakische Eigennamen aus den Nordägäischen Küsten'.⁸ Otherwise she had to rely on chance information gleaned from her extensive reading.

³ Robert, *OMS* 2, 986.

⁴ F. Papazoglou, 'Sur la structure ethnique de l'ancienne Macédoine', *Balkanica* 8 (1977), 65–83 (in Serbian with a French abstract).

⁵ F. Papazoglou, 'Structures ethniques et sociales dans les régions centrales des Balkans à la lumière des études onomastiques', *Actes du VI^e congrès international de l'épigraphie grecque et latine* (Bucharest and Paris, 1979), 153–69.

⁶ *Pulpudeva* 2 (1978), 128–46.

⁷ *IG* X (2) 1.

⁸ *Thracia*, II (Sofia, 1974), 261–79.

In both her papers Papazoglou attempted to match the ethnic groups known from the literary tradition—mainly Thucydides and Strabo—with the onomastic material which she had collected. For this purpose, she divided Macedonia into four geographical areas roughly corresponding to the four ancient *merides*: Pelagonia, Lower Macedonia, Thessalonike–Lete and Eastern Macedonia, and distributed among them the ‘native’, that is to say non-Greek, personal names. At the risk of oversimplifying her cautious and finely nuanced approach, it could be said that she deemed it possible to identify—beside a series of names which were not Greek or Illyrian or Thracian, and which were common to all four areas, as well as to Dardania and Thessaly beyond the Macedonian borders—a Brygian=Phrygian group, mostly present in the first two areas, a Paionian group in the third area, and an Edonian group in the fourth. In this distribution she saw confirmation of the ancient traditions according to which the conquering Macedonians occupied formerly Brygian territories in the foothills of Mount Bermion, forced Pierians to flee beyond the Strymon, expelled Bottians from the central plain into the Chalkidike peninsula, pushed Paionians back from the lower Axios valley to historical Paionia around the middle course of the river and drove Edonians from Mygdonia into areas beyond the Strymon.

Papazoglou admitted that the significant number of ‘native’ personal names common to more than one, and often to all four, of the areas, and sometimes occurring even outside them, raised the question of a common (Pelasgian?) *substratum*, and that this did not permit a clear differentiation between ethnic—or rather linguistic—groups. In the end she put forward a minimalist claim, namely that these ‘native’ names encountered in Macedonia, but also in Dardania and in Thessaly, constituted a separate, albeit multifarious, group not to be confused with either Illyrian or Thracian.

Twenty years later, even before the publication of *LGP*NIV, we can draw on a vastly expanded collection of personal names from Macedonia. Progress has been made not only in the quantity but also in the quality of the collected material. On the one hand, texts have been emended, with non-existent names struck out of our lists and new ones added. On the other hand, as archaeologists, ploughmen and construction workers have reached deeper and deeper strata of ancient sites, the epigraphic material, until now predominantly Roman, has received a most welcome hellenistic and classical addition. For the first time, a clearer picture of the pre-Roman onomastic situation in places such as Aigeai, Beroia, Pella, Kalindoia, and even the semi-rural communities of central Chalkidike, has emerged, adding

historical and sociological contours, that is to say wholly new dimensions, to the previously flat landscape of Macedonian onomastics. It is true that the ethnic and social structure of ancient Macedonia is still beyond our reach, but we have gained new insights into the history of early Macedonian expansion, which is largely unrecorded by literary authorities, and we can start to 'faire l'histoire par les noms', as Robert would have it, and in so doing contribute to the solution of an old puzzle, that of the origins of the ancient Macedonians.

It may not be possible to ascertain the ethnic origins of the different groups of 'native' names, but we are in a position to identify the names borne by the conquering Macedonians themselves. Papazoglou distinguished three groups of names of the Macedones *proprie dicti*: common Greek names also attested in Macedonia at an early period, such as Agathon, Nikandros, Neoptolemos, Pausanias; names of Greek origin (etymology) which were diffused in the Greek world as a result of Macedonian conquest or influence, such as Alexandros, Antipatros, Eurydike, Philippos, Archelaos; and names of Greek origin (etymology) which remained typically Macedonian, such as Aeropos, Alkimos, Alketas, Amyntas, Kleitos, Krateuas, Limnaios, Machatas, Perdikkas, and Peritas. Finally, she added a separate group of names known to have been borne by Macedonians from the earliest period of their history, but which have no plausible Greek etymology, such as Adaios, Gauanes, Derdas, Byrginos, Epokillos, and Iollas.

As Papazoglou's classification of names has been rendered partly obsolete by subsequent studies, especially those of O. Masson,⁹ and may create some confusion, I prefer to redefine the onomastic situation in Macedonia. The personal names attested for Macedonians or read on inscriptions discovered in Macedonia, from the earliest times down to the Roman conquest, fall into the following categories:

⁹ Cf. the following articles by O. Masson: 'Pape-Benseleriana IV. Les avatars de Machatas', *ZPE* 21 (1976), 157-8 = *OGS*, 257-8; 'Deux noms doriens chez Callimaque, Ἀρίμματος, Ἐχέμματος, et quelques noms en -μματος', *Rev. Phil.* 50 (1976), 24-31 = *OGS*, 259-66; 'Sur le nom de Bilistiché, favorite de Ptolémée II', *Studia in honorem, I. Kajanto* (Helsinki, 1985), 109-12 = *OGS*, 467-70; 'Une question delphique: qui étaient les "Mysiens" de Lilaia?', *REG* 106 (1993), 163-7; 'Quand le nom Πτολεμαῖος était à la mode', *ZPE* 98 (1993), 157-67; 'Nouvelles notes d'anthroponymie grecque', *ZPE* 102 (1994), 179-84; 'Quelques noms macédoniens dans le traité *IG I² 71 = I³ 89*', *ZPE* 123 (1998) 117-20 (posthumously published communication to the VIIIth International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy held in Athens in 1982, which was part of a more comprehensive project dealing with all the Macedonian names in the treaty between Athens and Macedonia).

1 names with a clear Greek etymology which can be considered as epichoric (a) because they diverge from the phonetic standards of Attic-Ionic *koine* (the linguistic vehicle by which cultural innovations from southern Greece were introduced into Macedonia), e.g. Machatas; (b) because throughout antiquity they remained practically confined to Macedonians, e.g. Paterinos;

2 other clearly Greek names, which may be labelled as panhellenic, although several of them could be equally considered as epichoric (a) because they spread outside Macedonia only as a consequence of Macedonian conquest or influence, e.g. Alexandros, or (b) because they were extremely popular in Macedonia and at the same time did not manifest any phonetic characteristics betraying a non-Macedonian origin, obviously belonging to an onomastic heritage common to Macedonia and to the rest of Greece, e.g. Menandros;

3 identifiable foreign names (Thracian, Illyrian, 'native', such as Amadokos, Plator, or Doules respectively);

4 names without a readily recognizable Greek etymology but which nevertheless cannot be ascribed to any identifiable non-Greek linguistic group, e.g. Bordinos.

We now have several 'closed' sets of names which are unquestionably Macedonian, either because they date from the period when Macedonia proper did not extend beyond the Axios or because they belong to persons undoubtedly hailing from the Old Kingdom. A good example of the first category is the fifth-century list of the Macedonians who, led by Perdikkas, swore to the treaty between Macedonia and Athens (Table 1);¹⁰ and of the second, the fourth-century list of the first thirty eponymous priests of the new Kalindoia refounded as a Macedonian city, 'after King Alexander gave to the Macedonians Kalindoia and the territories around Kalindoia: Thamiskia, Kamakaia, Tripoatis' (Table 2).¹¹ A comparison of these two documents shows that the onomastic habits of the Macedonians changed only marginally during the century that separates them, despite the momentous transformations that had taken place in the meantime, especially in the reigns of Philip II and Alexander the Great.

¹⁰ *IG* I³ 89.

¹¹ *SEG* 36, 626; cf. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, II, 84–5, no. 62.

Table 1. IG I³ 89

Macedonian with a clear Greek etymology	Panhellenic		Thracian, Illyrian, 'native' etc.	Not readily classifiable
	Particularly popular in Macedonia	Other		
Ἀγέλαος	Ἀγάθων	Εὐρύλοχος		Ἀγερρος
Ἀλικέτας	Ἀλέξανδρος	Καλλίμαχος		Ἄδιμος
Ἀρχέλαος	Ἀντιγένης	Κλέανδρος		Ἀρραβαῖος
Ἀττακῆνος	Ἀντίοχος	Μίσγων		Ἀὑπάνιος
Λιμναῖος	Καλλίας	Νουμήνιος		Βορδίνος
Λύκαιος	Μελέαγρος	Παντάπονος		Βόττης
Μαχάτας	Νικάνδρος			Βοῦκρης
Μενέλαος	Παυσανίας			Βυργίνος
Νεοπόλεμος	Φίλιππος			Γαιτέας
Περδίκικας				Δαδίνος
				Δέρδας
				Διρβέας
				Ἴθθαρος
				Εὐλανδρος
				Ἰδάτας
				Κραπένας
				Κορράβων
				Κορράτας
				Κράστων
				Σταδμείας

Table 2. SEG 36 (1986), 626

Macedonian with a clear Greek etymology	Panhellenic Particularly popular in Macedonia	Thracian, Illyrian, 'native' etc.	Not readily classifiable
Ἀγαθάνωρ	Ἀγάθων	Ἀντιμένης	Ἀμμα [---]
Ἀμερία	Γλανκιάς	Ἀντιφάνης	Ἀσσα[-]μικος
Ἀντίγονος	Καλλιάς	Ἀπολλώνιος	Γοδιάς
Ἄρθαλος	Κυδίας	Εὐρύτιος	Γύλις
Ἀστίων	Μένανδρος	Ἠγήσιππος	Γύρτος
Λεωνίδα	Φίλαγρος	Ἡρόδαμος	Δαβρέας
Μενέλαος	Φιλόξενος	Κράτιππος	Φαδύς
Νικάνωρ		Κρίθων	Τικότας
Παρμενίων		Λυκοῦργος	Κερτίμας
Περδικκας		Λυκόξενος	Κάνων
Πάσων		Σκύθης	Μύας
Πολέμμας		Τρωίλος	Σίβρας
Φιλώτας		Φιλίσκος	

Each list comprises forty-five names which are either wholly preserved or can be securely identified. In the earlier list, ten names are indisputably Greek but with an evidently local colour, either because they diverge from Ionic-Attic phonetic standards or because they remained throughout antiquity almost exclusively Macedonian; sixteen could be described as panhellenic, although nine of them remained particularly popular in Macedonia throughout antiquity, or first spread in the Greek world in the hellenistic period because of Macedonian conquest or influence; twenty have no readily recognizable Greek etymology or can only be classified as dubious, though at least fifteen of them are more or less certainly Greek, and only three are almost certainly non-Greek (Arrabaios, Derdas, Dirbeas).

The corresponding numbers in the later list are thirteen typically Macedonian but indisputably Greek names, twenty panhellenic (though seven of them remained particularly popular amongst Macedonians), twelve with no readily recognizable Greek etymology or else dubious, of which nine are probably Greek, and three non-Greek (Assa[.]mikos, Dabreias, Sibras). Thus, over a century the total number of Greek versus non-Greek names remains constant, but there is an increase in panhellenic and readily recognizable local Greek names, and a corresponding decrease in names not readily recognizable as Greek, or of disputed etymology.

This trend, evidently connected with the opening of Macedonia to influences from the rest of Greece, can be verified by yet another important list, also from the Old Kingdom but dating from the third century (Table 3).¹² It is a list of sixty infantry officers from Beroia who in 223 BC were granted fiscal privileges by Antigonos Dason. As they are listed with their patronymics, they reveal the personal names of 119 citizens of Beroia (at least two officers are brothers and have the same patronymic), who were given their names in roughly the first or second quarter of the third century. As four names cannot be securely read and many others occur more than once, indeed in some instances several times, we are dealing in fact with some eighty-three names. Of these, some fifty-seven can be described as panhellenic, although as many as sixteen owe their popularity to Macedonian influence, or were particularly popular in Macedonia, nineteen as Greek but specifically Macedonian, and seven as lacking any readily recognizable etymology or dubious, though five of them are almost certainly Greek (Balakros, Bettalos, Botrichos, Meidon, Teutios).

¹² V. Allamani-Souri and E. Voutiras, 'New Documents from the Sanctuary of Herakles Kynagidas at Beroia', *Ἐπιγραφές τῆς Μακεδονίας* (Thessalonike, 1996); cf. *BE*1997, no. 370.

Table 3. *Επιγραφές Μακεδονίας 13–39*

Macedonian with a clear Greek etymology	Panhellenic		Thracian, Illyrian, 'native' etc.	Not readily classifiable
	Particularly popular in Macedonia	Other		
Ἀγησίστρατος	Ἀγάθων	Ἀκίμαχος	Ἀδαίος	ΑΙΚΚΥΡΟΥ (gen.).
Ἀγάνωρ	Ἀλέξανδρος	Ἀλκιμος	Βάλακρος	
Ἀμύντας	Γλαυκίας	Ἀνήνωρ	Βέπταλος	
Ἀντίγονος	Εἰκαδίων	Ἀρίσταρχος	Βότριχος	
Ἀντίπατρος	Ζωίλος	Ἀριστογένης	Μεΐδων	
Ἀριστόλαος	Μελέαγρος	Ἀριστοκλήης	Τεύτιος	
Ἀρμενίος	Μένανδρος	Ἀρίστος		
Ἄρπαιος	Μικίων	Δενιάς		
Κλισίμαχος	Νίκανδρος	Δήμαρχος		
Λαμῆδων	Ὀρέστης	Δημόφιλος		
Μαχάτας	Παράμονος	Διαγόρας		
Νικάχιμος	Πανσανίας	Δερκυλίδης		
Νικάνωρ	Πολεμαῖος	Διονύσιος		
Νικόλαος	Πύρρος	Δίφιλος		
Περίτας	Φίλιππος	Ἐπικράτης		
Ποίμαχος	Φιλόξενος	Ἐπίνικος		
Παρμενίων		Ἐπιτέλης		
Σταπόλεμος		Ἐρμων		
Φονίκιλος		Εὐβίωτος		
		Εὐδημίδης		
		Εὐδικος		
		Εὐθύνους		
		Εὐφρων		
		Ζωπυρίων		
		Ἡγήσανδρος		
		Ἡλιδώροϛ		

Table 3 continued.

Macedonian with a clear Greek etymology	Panhellenic Particularly popular in Macedonia	Thracian, Illyrian, 'native' etc.	Not readily classifiable
	Other		
	Ἰππόστρατος		
	Κάλλιππος		
	Λυγκεύς		
	Λυσίπολις		
	Μενεκράτης		
	Νικίας		
	Νικόδημος		
	Ξενοφών		
	Ποσειδῆπιος		
	Σωγένης		
	Σωσιμένης		
	Σωσθένης		
	Τιμοκλής		
	Τιμοκράτης		
	Φίλων		

The results from the study of these three lists are set out in Tables 1–3 (above, 104 f. and 107 f.). Such evidence, especially when it is attested at a relatively early date, for instance before the end of the fourth century, gives us a fairly clear idea of the onomastic effects one should expect Macedonian conquest and colonization to have entailed. This enables us to check the trustworthiness of literary traditions about the early, virtually prehistoric expansion of the Macedonian Kingdom, and to supplement or clarify ambiguous historical information about Philip II's policy in the conquered territories beyond the Axios, both crucial phases of Macedonian history.

To take the earlier period, Thucydides seems to indicate a difference between the treatment of the Pieres, Bottiaioi, Almopes, Eordoi and Edones on the one hand and the 'natives' of Anthemous, Krestonia and Bisaltia on the other.¹³ Of the former, he says that they were either exterminated or expelled, while he records nothing of the sort concerning the others, which might be taken to imply that they did not suffer the same fate. N.G.L. Hammond has relied on this passage to reconstruct Temenid policy in the conquered territories: ruthless in the earlier stages of the conquest, more humane under Amyntas I and then deteriorating once more into 'ethnic cleansing' under Alexander I.¹⁴ By contrast, archaeologists such as Julia Vokotopoulou and linguists such as Anna Panayotou, arguing from resemblances between artefacts discovered at the archaic cemetery of Hagia Paraskeve in Anthemous and at various cemeteries in Macedonia, have asserted the conquest and massive Macedonian colonization of the Anthemous valley from about 575 BC.¹⁵

The onomastic material, however, tells a quite different story. A mid-fourth-century deed of sale and an early third-century royal grant reveal to us eight personal names from Strepsa, one of the two main settlements of Anthemous. These names, which were given before the end of the fourth century, are Bilthes, Arnios (?), Nemenios, Gouras, Annythes, Chionides, Eualkes, and Demetrios.¹⁶ Five of them may be classified as panhellenic, with

¹³ Thucydides 2. 99. 3–6. Cf. Hatzopoulos-Loukopoulou, *Recherches*, 15–31.

¹⁴ N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia*, 1 (Oxford, 1972), 437–9; 2 (Oxford, 1979), 62, 64–5.

¹⁵ J. Vokotopoulou and C. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, *Ancient Macedonia* (Athens, 1988), 27; *Greek Civilisation* (Athens, 1993), 150; A. Panayotou, 'Dialectal Inscriptions from Chalcidice, Macedonia and Amphipolis', *Ἐπιγραφές τῆς Μακεδονίας*, 135, with further bibliography on p. 147 n. 22; cf. my commentary in *BE* 1997, no. 402.

¹⁶ M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Une donation du roi Lysimaque* (Meletemata 5; Athens, 1988), 17–18 and 42 n. 5.

clear Ionic phonetic traits present in three of them (Chionides, Eualkes, Demetrios), and three as 'native' (Bilthes, Gouras, Annythes). None betrays any Macedonian presence or influence. In fact, the range of names used in the fourth-century Anthemous valley is strictly comparable to that of the adjoining Bottice, as revealed to us by a mid-fourth-century deed of sale from Spartolos.¹⁷ Of the nine personal names and patronymics of the five people mentioned there, three are panhellenic, two of them, moreover, with an Ionic morphology in their declension (Peison, Tauriades, Polemokrates) and five are 'native' (Tarbes, Sedeles, Poris, Bases, Gouras).

Onomastic evidence of Macedonian presence in this area first appears in the reign of Alexander the Great, as a result of the colonization policy of his father Philip II. Even then such names form a small minority. Down to the Roman imperial period, the bulk of the onomastic material consists of Greek names without any particular regional flavour, while 'native' names, comparable in numbers to the Macedonian, persist until the end of the period.¹⁸ This is a welcome reminder that distinctive material cultures cannot, and should not without corroborative evidence, be equated with ethnic or linguistic groups.

As for the other, and later, crucial phase of Macedonian expansion, time and again in the last ten years new onomastic evidence has enabled us to define the colonization policy of Philip II and his successors. Louisa Loukopoulou and I used such evidence in our study of Morrylos, which can be considered as a test case for Macedonian colonization policy in Krestonia.¹⁹ The intrusion of Macedonian settlers in the fourth century, directly attested only in a contemporary funerary epigram,²⁰ emerges unmistakably from the study of the hellenistic onomastic material: all seventeen Morrylians known to us had a personal name or a patronymic whose origin can be traced in the Old Kingdom west of the Axios, while the only person with an identifiably non-Greek name had a typically Macedonian patronymic.

In my study of the annexation of Amphipolis, I traced the gradual penetration of Macedonian names in the deeds of sale from 356 BC onwards, but

¹⁷ I. A. Papangelos, 'A Purchase Agreement from Bottice', *Ἐπιγραφές τῆς Μακεδονίας*, 164–72, with my commentary, *BE* 1997, no. 402.

¹⁸ Hatzopoulos-Loukopoulou, *Recherches*, 65–7.

¹⁹ M.B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulou, *Morrylos cité de la Crestonie* (Meletemata 7; Athens, 1989), 77–8.

²⁰ Unpublished inscription in the Museum of Kilkis.

I also showed that persons with Ionic and even 'native' names continued in positions of prestige and power, and that commercial transactions were conducted between them on an equal footing. This provided epigraphic corroboration of Diodoros' assertion that, after the conquest of the city by Philip II, only his political enemies were exiled, while the other Amphipolitans received humane treatment and remained, along with the Macedonian settlers, as fully enfranchised citizens in the urban centre as well as the *chora*.²¹

Onomastic material has been equally valuable in enabling us to distinguish between Macedonia proper and the external possessions of its kings. The extreme scarcity of recognizable Macedonian names, along with the use of a different calendar, the presence of particular magistracies, and the avoidance of the ethnic *Makedon* among the citizens of Kassandreia and Philippoi in the early hellenistic period, has enabled us to establish that these royal foundations were not originally part of Macedonia proper but had been founded as theoretically independent cities allied to the Macedonian kings, and were populated by the disenfranchised citizens of Olynthos and the other cities of the Chalkidic *Koinon* in the first case, and by the colonists of the Thasian Peraia in the second.²²

Systematic use of the onomastic material has made it possible to trace the expansion of Macedonia proper and of Macedonian settlers from the banks of the Haliakmon and the Loudias to those of the Axios and the Strymon. Thus Pella, still Ionic in dialect and personal names in the fifth and at the beginning of the fourth century, yields no evidence of Macedonian colonization before the reign of Amyntas III. The rest of Lower Paionia, as well as western Mygdonia and Krestonia, had been colonized by the end of the reign of Philip II. Study of the onomastic material from Europos, Lete, and Morrylos, as representative of these three regions, shows an overwhelming presence of Macedonian settlers in the hellenistic period. However, this did not mean the extermination or the wholesale expulsion of the pre-Greek population, as is shown by the re-emergence of 'native' names in the Roman period.²³ But by then the two elements of the population had completely

²¹ Diodorus 16. 8. 2; M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis* (Meletemata 14; Athens, 1991), 74–86.

²² M. B. Hatzopoulos, 'Décret pour un bienfaiteur de la cité de Philippes', *BCH* 117 (1993), 315–26; 'Le statut de Cassandree à l'époque hellénistique', *Ancient Macedonia*, 5 (Thessalonike, 1993), 575–84; cf. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions*, I, 188 n. 1.

²³ Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions*, I, 171–9 and 211–13.

blended, as is demonstrated by the use of personal names of both origins within the same families.

The colonization and incorporation into Macedonia proper of eastern Mygdonia, Anthemous and northern Bottike, with the cities of Therma, Apollonia, Arethousa, Anthemous, and Kalindoia, followed in the latter part of the reign of Philip II and/or in the earlier part of the reign of Alexander the Great.²⁴ The existence of Macedonian cavalry *ilai* from Anthemous and Apollonia, and especially the fourth-century list of the eponymous priests of Kalindoia, leave no doubt about the presence of Macedonian settlers, but at the same time the onomastic material from the Roman period shows that there too the earlier inhabitants were neither exterminated nor expelled.²⁵ Despite the founding of new Macedonian cities by Kassander and Antigonos Gonatas in Mygdonia and northern Chalkidike (Thessalonike, Antigoneia, Stratonikeia), as we move south of Mount Cholomon and east of the Rendina Pass evidence of Macedonian colonization becomes thinner and thinner. In the Strymon valley and on the Pierian coast, with the notable exception of Amphipolis, it is practically non-existent, and there is no evidence of Macedonian colonization after the reign of Philip II.²⁶ As Strabo explicitly states, the Strymon became not only the political but also the ethnic frontier of Macedonia proper.²⁷

With the help of personal names we have been able to follow the growth of Macedonia from the fifth to the third century, as it expanded from the Haliakmon valley to that of the Strymon. Might it be possible, with the help of the same onomastic material, to trace back the steps of the future Macedonian conquerors as they moved from their prehistoric homeland to the 'cradle of Macedonian power'?²⁸ I believe that the key to the solution of the problem of Macedonian origins lies in the personal names of the first and the fourth categories defined above.

If we examine names of the first category occurring in the list appended to the Attico-Macedonian treaty of 423 (above), we see that almost all of them were also popular in Epirus (Archelaos, Menelaos, Neoptolemos, Alketas, Machatas, Alexandros, Antiochos, Nikandros, Pausanias, Philippos) or in

²⁴ Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions*, I, 189–99.

²⁵ Cf. Hatzopoulos–Loukopoulou, *Recherches*, 65–7, 117–22, 197–346.

²⁶ Cf. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions*, I, 181–9, 199–204.

²⁷ Strabo 7. 7. 4.

²⁸ Cf. A. Delacoulonche, 'Le berceau de la puissance macédonienne des bords de l'Haliacmon à ceux de l'Axios', *Archives des Missions Scientifiques et Littéraires* 8 (1859), 67–288.

Thessaly (Agelaos, Archelaos, Menelaos, Neoptolemos, Machatas, Alexandros, Antiochos, Nikandros, Pausanias, Philippos). These are manifestly part of the onomastic heritage of northern Greece common to Epirotes, Thessalians, and Macedonians alike. Of the remaining names of the first category, Attakinos, in the form Attaginos, is attested in Boeotia (Thebes),²⁹ while Limnaios and Lykaios seem to be exclusively Macedonian, as does Perdikkas, although it is attested later in Thessaly.³⁰ These facts are consistent with the conclusions of a recent study of the Macedonian calendar.³¹ The presence of the month Apellaios ties the Macedonians in with the western Greeks, that of Loios with the Thessalians and the Boeotians. It is possible that both Apellaios and Loios belong to a common northern Greek heritage, and that at some stage the Thessalians and the Boeotians lost the one and the western Greeks the other. Alternatively, the two months may have been inherited: one derived from each of the two population groups which, as I have suggested elsewhere, coalesced to form the Macedonian *ethnos*. *Mutatis mutandis* we could say the same of names such as Alketas and Attakinos, of which the first is virtually unknown in Thessaly and the second is not attested in Epirus.

The intermediate position of the Macedonian dialect(s) between the Thessalian and the Epirote was deduced long ago from several isoglosses which it shares with both.³² This, however, has not helped either to solve the puzzle of the fourth category of names, that is to say those without a readily recognizable Greek etymology, or of the precise homeland of the population group which was to become the founding element of the Kingdom of Lower Macedonia, and which included bearers of such names. It is perhaps possible that bringing together these two problems may produce a solution for both.

Once again, much of the progress accomplished in the study of these difficult Macedonian names is due to the efforts of O. Masson. In a posthumously published paper he convincingly argued that Stadmeas, Bordinos, and Byrginos were just Macedonian phonetic variants of the names Stathmeas (cf.

²⁹ Herodotus 9. 15–16, 86, 88.

³⁰ Cf. *IG IX (2)* 206 IIb, 8.

³¹ C. Trümpy, *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen* (Heidelberg, 1997), 262–5.

³² Cf. F. Solmsen, review of O. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum* (Göttingen, 1906), *BPhW* 9 (1907), 273–4; J. N. Kalleris, *Les anciens Macédoniens*, 2 (Athens, 1976), 488–94; M. B. Sakellariou, 'The Inhabitants' in *Macedonia: 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization* (Athens, 1983), 57; N. G. L. Hammond, 'Literary Evidence for Macedonian Speech', *Historia* 43 (1994), 131–42 = *Collected Studies IV*, 77–88; M. B. Hatzopoulos 'Le macédonien: nouvelles données et théories nouvelles', *Ancient Macedonia*, 6 (Thessalonike, 1999) 225–39.

Stathmias), Portinos and Phyrkinos, known from other parts of Greece, and he thus offered an indirect confirmation of Solmsen's interpretation of Gaiteas as a phonetic variant of Chaiteas (cf. Chaiton).³³ For most of the other 'difficult' names on the list satisfactory Greek etymologies have been proposed. Thus, there is little doubt that Agerros should be associated with the Eresos month Agerranios and the corresponding festival Agerrania, Agriania, Agrionia,³⁴ which, as I hope to have shown, was dedicated to Dionysos Agrios, or Agerros in the dialectal form of the epithet.³⁵ Hadima, the feminine name corresponding to the Macedonian (H)Adimos, is attested in Thera;³⁶ the typically Macedonian name Botres and its variant Botrys are inseparable from the corresponding common name meaning 'bunch of grapes', whatever its etymology;³⁷ Boukris is attested in Aitolia.³⁸ Eulandros is undoubtedly a *supercompositum* of the typically Macedonian name Laandros, itself a compound of 'laos' and 'aner'.³⁹ Kratennas, like Krateuas, is derived from 'kratos' with a suffix comparable to that of Myllenas.⁴⁰ Idatas, like other Greek names, is formed from the root **wid*.⁴¹ Autannios and Etharos seem to derive respectively from 'autos' (cf. Eminauta)⁴² and 'ethos' (cf. the name Ethos attested in Beroia)⁴³ or, more probably, from the adjective 'itharos' (= 'cheerful'), of which it is perhaps a phonetic variant.⁴⁴

³³ O. Masson, 'Quelques noms' (above n. 9); cf. F. Solmsen, *KZ* 34 (1897), 550; F. Bechtel, *Die einstämmigen männlichen Personennamen des Griechischen, die aus Spitznamen hervorgegangen sind*, Abhandlungen der Göttingischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, n. s. II.5 (Berlin, 1898), 36; Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen*, 143.

³⁴ Cf. Catherine Trümpy, *Untersuchungen* (above n. 31), 247 and 251.

³⁵ M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Cultes et rites de passage en Macédoine* (Meletemata 19; Athens, 1994), 63–72.

³⁶ *LGPN* I, 14.

³⁷ Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen*, 150; cf. L. Robert, *Villes d'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1962), 249; and in N. Firatli, *Les stèles funéraires de Byzance greco-romaine* (Paris, 1964), 145 (Botrys). Although the name Botres seems particular to Macedonia while Botrys has a much wider diffusion, in my opinion both forms derive from the same stem, see P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, 187.

³⁸ *IG IX* (1)² (1); XIX, 100; XXII, 44; LIV, 17.

³⁹ *BE* 1994, no. 405; cf. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen*, 142.

⁴⁰ Cf. Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen*, 149.

⁴¹ Cf. Πολύιδος, Εΰιδος, Ίδύλος etc.: Bechtel, *HP*, 216.

⁴² O. Masson, 'Quelques noms grecs rares', *Philologus* 110 (1966), 246–8 = *OGS*, 81–3.

⁴³ *Ἐπιγραφεὶς Κατὰ Μακεδονίας*, I (Athens, 1998), 156; cf. ἡθεῖος, ἡθαῖος signifying 'trusty', 'trusty friend'.

⁴⁴ Cf. A. Tataki, *Ancient Beroea: Prosopography and Society* (Meletemata 8; Athens, 1988), 358 n. 218, with full references. It is interesting to note that this rare name is attested in Macedonia (V. Beševliev and G. Mihailov, *Belomorski Pregled* 1 (1942), 321 no. 6).

The names Korratas, Korrabon and Korragos have been convincingly interpreted by A. Heubeck as Aeolic variants of a family of names which derive from the pre-literary Greek word **koria* signifying 'host', 'army'.⁴⁵ Dadinós is probably formed on the *Lallname* Dados, of no clear origin.⁴⁶ Finally Kraston, like the corresponding toponym Krastonia–Graistonia–Grestonia–Krestonia⁴⁷ meaning, or understood as meaning, 'pasture land', belongs to the family of 'krastis–grastis' (= 'grass').⁴⁸ This leaves us with three names (Arrabaios, Derdas, Dirbeas) without any convincing etymology in Greek or in any other known language.

Interesting as these etymologies propounded by an Areopagus of distinguished linguists are, they cannot compare with the major breakthrough of the explanation of the names Bordinos, Byrginos, Gaiteas and Stadmeas, which we owe to Hoffmann and to Masson,⁴⁹ for this wavering between voiced and unvoiced consonants affects a significant number of proper names and other words transmitted by lexicographers, and has given rise to elaborate theories regarding the ancestral tongue of the Macedonians. The most recent suggestion is that the historical Macedonians were the product of the fusion of two linguistic groups. One spoke a Greek dialect akin to the north-western dialects and to Thessalian, which was used down to the hellenistic period. The other consisted of speakers of Brygian (that is to say European Phrygian), whose language became extinct in the fifth century after making an important impact on religion and the onomastics of the Macedonian ruling class, attesting thereby the significant role played by the speakers of this language in the genesis of the historical Macedonian entity.⁵⁰

In another paper I have tried to show the utter improbability of this reconstructed 'Brygian' which would be nothing else but transvestite Greek, since 'blond' would be called *xandos*, 'bald' *balakros*, 'mane' *gaita*, 'station' *stadmos*, 'spin' *kloda*, 'friend' *bilos*, 'victory' *nika* and so on. It had, however, not been noticed that there is a region outside Macedonia, but close to it,

⁴⁵ A. Heubeck, 'Κοίρανος, Κόρραγος und Verwandtes', *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 4 (1978), 91–8. It should be stressed that the area of distribution of this family of names is not limited to Macedonia, but includes Thessaly and extends even to adjacent regions (Boeotia and north-western Greece).

⁴⁶ Cf. O. Masson, 'Quelques noms macédoniens' (above n. 9).

⁴⁷ For the different forms of the name, see E. Oberhummer, 'Krestoner', *RE* XI, 1718.

⁴⁸ Cf. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique*, I, 237, s.v. γράω.

⁴⁹ Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen*, 141–50; O. Masson, 'Quelques noms macédoniens' (above n. 9).

⁵⁰ For a recent discussion, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, 'Le macédonien: nouvelles données et théories nouvelles', *Ancient Macedonia*, 6 (Thessalonike, 1999).

where this unique phonetic phenomenon of wavering between voiced and unvoiced consonants occurs. This is Tripolis of Perrhaibia, where we encounter personal names which manifest the same phenomenon. It is important to stress that any idea of borrowing from Macedonia is improbable, since it affects names unattested in Macedonia, such as Drebelaos (= Trepheleos), Boulonoa (= Phylonoa; cf. Boulomaga, Phylomaga = Phylomacha), or attested in a different form, such as Pantordanas (= Pantorthanas), Stadmeias (= Stathmeias). Moreover, the region abounds in names of our first category, those particularly popular in Macedonia, such as Agathon, Adaios, Hadeia, Hadymos, Alexandros, Amyntas, Antigonos, Antipatros, Asandros, Bouplagos, Zoilos, Kassandros, Leonnatos, Meleagros, Menandros, Nikanor, Nikandros, Nikolaos, Paramonos, Parmenion, Pausanias, Pierion, Ptolemaios, Phila, Philippos, Philotas.⁵¹ Even more significant is the presence of 'difficult' names which are otherwise attested only among pastoral communities of Macedonia and Epirus, such as Derdas and Arybbas (Arrybas), or which seem exclusively Macedonian, such as Perdikkas.⁵²

Linguistic evidence alone would not be conclusive, if it did not point to precisely the place where the literary tradition, that is to say the contemporary Hesiodic Catalogue, places the Macedonians in the second half of the eighth century: *Μάγνητα Μακηδόνα θ' ἱππιοχάρμην, | οἷ περι Πιερίην καὶ Ὀλυμπον δώματ' ἔναιον.*⁵³ N. G. L. Hammond has repeatedly stressed that at that period the Macedonians, who practised transhumant pastoralism, had their summer pastures on Mount Titarion, which belongs to the Perrhaibian Tripolis, and their winter pastures in the southern Emathian plain; in that sense they were fellow-dwellers with the Bryges, who most probably constituted the linguistic *adstratum* responsible for the wavering between voiced and unvoiced in the pronunciation of consonants. The

⁵¹ Ib.

⁵² I owe this collection of material to the unpublished part of G. Lucas' doctoral thesis, *Les cités antiques de la haute vallée du Titarèse (Thessalie)* (Lyon, 1992); cf. *Les cités antiques de la haute vallée du Titarèse: étude de topographie et de géographie historique* (Lyon, 1997).

⁵³ Hes. *Γυναικῶν κατάλογος*, fr. 7: *Μάγνητα Μακηδόνα θ' ἱππιοχάρμην, | οἷ περι Πιερίην καὶ Ὀλυμπον δώματ' ἔναιον*; cf. Hdt. 1.56. 2-3: *τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἔθνος . . . ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ Δευκαλίωνος βασιλέως οἴκεε γῆν τὴν Φθιώτιν, ἐπὶ δὲ Δώρου τοῦ Ἑλλήνος τὴν ὑπὸ τὴν Ὀσσαν τε καὶ τὸν Ὀλυμπον χώραν, καλομένην δὲ Ἰστιαιώτιν. Ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἰστιαιώτιδος ὡς ξεανέστη ὑπὸ Καδμείων, οἴκεε ἐν Πίνδῳ Μακεδνὸν καλεόμενον.* 'The country under Ossa and Olympus' corresponds exactly to Hesiod's 'Pieria and Olympus'. Is it a mere coincidence that, as A. Tziafalias has announced, more than fifty dedications to Apollo Dorios were recently discovered at Apollo's sanctuary at Pythion in the Perrhaibian Tripolis?

mountain paths they used through Daskion and Sphekia to Vergina and the Emathian plain beyond are now being explored with very interesting results by Angelike Kottaridou.⁵⁴ As Hammond again has recalled, in modern times too, the area of Livadi in the Perrhaibian Tripolis became the cradle of a group of transhumant shepherds speaking a distinctive Vlach dialect.⁵⁵ Thus the weight of scores of names confirms a theory about the prehistory of the Macedonians otherwise based on a single text of an ancient author and a modern parallel. Would Robert have foretold that the progress of onomastic studies, that he somewhat derogatorily called 'des catalogues de noms', would one day enable us to make not only 'l'histoire par les noms' but also 'la préhistoire par les noms'?

⁵⁴ Angelike Kottaridou and Charikleia Brekoulaki, 'Ἀρχαιολογικὲς ἔρευνες στὰ ἡμαθιώτικα Πιέρια', *Τὸ ἀρχαιολογικὸ ἔργο στὴ Μακεδονία καὶ Θράκη 11, 1997* (Thessalonike, 1997), 109–14.

⁵⁵ N. G. L. Hammond, *The Macedonian State* (Oxford, 1989), 4.

PERCEPTION OF THE SELF AND THE OTHER:
THE CASE OF MACEDON*

M. B. Hatzopoulos

In my communication to the last Ancient Macedonia symposium on the character of the ancestral tongue of the Macedonians I cautioned that I did not pretend to solve the controverted question of the “nationality” of the ancient Macedonians, not only because language is, at best, only one of the several elements which contribute to the formation of group identity, but also –and mainly– because such a debate presupposed a previous response to the question of the nature of “nationality” in ancient Greece, provided of course that this question is well formulated and admits an effective answer¹. In the ensuing years “ethnic” studies, as they are now called², have enjoyed, especially on the other side of the Atlantic, a wild success comparable only to that of that other New World invention, “gender” studies.³ Among recent publications on this subject the collective volume *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, Mass. and London 2001) edited by Irad Malkin stands out for its scholarly quality. Several of the included contributions and especially the “Introduction” and “Greek Ambiguities: Between ‘Ancient Hellas’ and ‘Barbarian Epirus’ ” by Irad Malkin himself and “Contested Ethnicities: Perceptions of Macedonia within Evolving Definitions of Greek Ethnicity” by Jonathan Hall, go a long way towards satisfying the condition I had laid down, to wit that the nature of Greek “nationality” be previously explored. Although a certain conformism of most contributors in their unreserved adoption of the “politically correct”

* Abbreviations are listed at the end of this paper. Christine Sourvinou-Inwood’s important paper “Greek Perceptions of Ethnicity and the Ethnicity of the Macedonians”, *Identità e prassi nel Mediterraneo greco* (Milano 2002), which the author had the kindness to send me, came to my knowledge too late for inclusion in the present discussion.

1. Hatzopoulos, “Macédonien” 225: “La présente communication ne prétend nullement résoudre la question tant controversée de la ‘nationalité’ des anciens Macédoniens. Un tel débat présuppose une réponse à la question préalable de la nature de la ‘nationalité’ dans le monde grec, à supposer qu’une telle question soit bien posée et qu’elle comporte effectivement une réponse. Quoi qu’il en soit, il est hors de doute que la langue n’est au mieux qu’un des éléments qui concourent au sentiment d’appartenance d’un groupe...”

2. Cf. F. W. Walbank, “Hellenes and Achaeans: ‘Greek Nationality’ Revisited”, *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (*Historia Einzelschriften* 138; Stuttgart 2000) 18. F. W. Walbank, in 1951, still named his relevant article, without any inverted commas, “The Problem of Greek Nationality”, *Phoenix* 5 (1951) 41-60 (= *Selected Papers* [Cambridge 1985] 1-19). Is it merely coincidental that the word “ethnicity” is untranslatable –except as a calque– in languages such as French or Greek?

3. Cf. the rich bibliography in J. Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, Cambridge 1997; in I. Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity*, Berkeley, Cal. 1998; and at the end of each contribution in the collective volume I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, Cambridge Mass. - London 2001. Among the numerous recent works, besides those already cited, I would also mention the following: Cinzia Bearzot, “La Grecia di Pausania. Geografia e cultura nella definizione del concetto di Ἑλλάς”, in Marta Sordi (ed.), *Geografia e storiografia nel mondo classico*, Milan 1988, 90-112; Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*, Oxford 1989; Catherine Morgan, “Ethnicity and Early Greek States: Historical and Material Perspectives”, *PCPhS* 37 (1991) 131-63; E. N. Borza, “Ethnicity and Cultural Policy at Alexander’s Court”, *AncW* 22 (1991) 21-25 (= *Makedonika*, Claremont Cal. 1995, 149-58); Marta Sordi (ed.), *Autocoscienza e rappresentazione dei popoli nell’antichità*, Milan 1992; P. Cartledge, *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*, Oxford - New York 1993; Catherine Morgan, “The Origins of Panhellenism”, in Nanno Marinatos – R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek Sanctuaries*, London - New York 1993, 18-44; A. Giovannini, “Greek Cities and Greek Commonwealth”, in A. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long, A. Stuart (eds.), *Images and Ideology: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley - Los Angeles-London 1993, 265-86; J. Hall, “The Role of Language in Greek Ethnicities”, *PCPhS* 41 (1995) 83-100; F. Cassola, “Chi erano i Greci?”, in S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci: Storia, cultura, arte, società*, 2.1, Turin 1996, 5-23; D. Asheri, “Identità greche, identità greca”, in the same work 2.2, Turin 1997, 5-26.

antiessentialist view, which reduces group identities to mere inventions constructed on pure discourse, needs to be watered down⁴, the result is impressive, and Jonathan Hall's paper in particular sets the parameters within which the question of the ancient Macedonian identity, which interests us here, can be approached.

Hall challenges the view that Macedonia was marginal or peripheral in respect to a Greek centre or core, for the simple reason that such a Greek hard core never existed, since “‘Greekness’ is constituted by the totality of multifocal, situationally bound, and self-conscious negotiations of identity not only between *poleis* and *ethne* but also within them”, and because a view such as this “assumes a transhistorically static definition of Greekness”⁵. As he argues at greater length in his monograph⁶, in the fifth century, mainly as a consequence of the Persian Wars, the definition of Greek identity evolved from an “aggregative” noninclusive conception based on fictitious descent from the eponymous Hellen and expressed in forged genealogies (which may leave outside not only Macedonians and Magnetes, but also other groups such as Arcadians or Aitolians) into an “oppositional” one, turned against out-groups, relegating thus (fictitious) community of blood to the same level –if not to an inferior one (*vide infra*)– as linguistic, religious and cultural criteria. (In this perspective there is not much sense in opposing a putative compact, homogeneous and immutable “Greekness” to the contested identities of groups such as the Aitolians, Locrians, Acarnanians, Thesprotians, Molossians, Chaones, Atintanes, Parauaioi, Orestai, Macedonians)⁷.

Hall proceeds to a penetrating analysis of the shifting definitions of Greekness in Herodotus, Thucydides and Isocrates, our main sources for the evolution of the concept in the Classical period. Of Thucydides in particular he writes that, contrary to Herodotus, he did not view Greeks and barbarians “as mutually exclusive categories” but as “opposite poles of a single, linear continuum”. Thus, the inhabitants of north-western Greece “are ‘barbarian’ not in the sense that their cultures, customs, or behavior are in direct, diametrical opposition to Greek norms but rather in the sense that their seemingly more primitive way of life makes them *Hellènes manqués*”⁸.

Finally, not only he but also I. Malkin in his introduction and Rosalind Thomas in her contribution “Ethnicity, Genealogy, and Hellenism in Herodotus”, which contains a section on the Macedonians, stress the importance of religion, or rather of cults⁹ (“common shrines of the gods and sacrifices”)¹⁰.

J. Hall in his conclusions confirms my doubts about the possibility of

⁴. And attracts the ironic scepticism of the editor (p. 1): “The tone of the current writings about ethnicity, any ethnicity, reflects a ubiquitous antiessentialism. Things have no essence, no ‘core’. Ethnicity? There is no such thing, as such, and the key words for discussing it are now ‘invention’ and ‘construction’ ”. (He might have added “discourse”).

⁵. Hall, “Ethnicities” 166.

⁶. Hall, *Identity* 40-51; cf. *id.*, “Language” 91-96.

⁷. As, for instance, E. N. Borza systematically does for the Macedonians. Cf. *In the Shadow of Olympus: The Emergence of Macedon*, Princeton, N.J. 1992², 94-97; 258; 268-72; 275-82; *id.*, *Before Alexander: Constructing Early Macedonia. Publications of the Associations of Ancient Historians* 6, Claremont Cal. 1999, 32-34.

⁸. Hall, “Ethnicities” 169-72.

⁹. Hall, “Ethnicities” 179, n. 92; Malkin, “Introduction” 6; Thomas, “Ethnicity” 215 and 219.

¹⁰. Cf. Herod. 8.144.2: ἀστίς δὲ τε ἑλληνικόν, ἄεν ἡμαίμων τε καὶ ἱμόγλωσσον, καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματα τε κοῖνα καὶ θυσίαι ἰθεῖα τε ἱμότροπα...

answering the question concerning the “nationality” of the ancient Macedonians. “To ask whether the Macedonians ‘really were’ Greek or not in antiquity“, he writes, “is ultimately a redundant question given the shifting semantics of Greekness between the sixth and fourth centuries B.C. What cannot be denied, however, is that the cultural commodification of Hellenic identity that emerged in the fourth century might have remained a provincial artifact, confined to the Balkan peninsula, had it not been for the Macedonians”¹¹.

This finely balanced verdict is all the more praiseworthy in that it does not hesitate explicitly¹² or implicitly to contradict¹³ authoritative views current in the American academic establishment¹⁴, or even to modify opinions previously expressed by the author himself¹⁵. Moreover, it was partly attained through sheer reasoning and intuition, as crucial evidence was not accessible to him.

Epigraphic data of capital linguistic interest which have become available only after the Center of Hellenic Studies Colloquium of 1997¹⁶ and important recent monographs and articles which seem not to have been accessible in the United States¹⁷, if known, would have provided additional arguments and prevented some minor inaccuracies¹⁸. It is worth noting, however, that although

¹¹. Hall, “Ethnicities” 172.

¹². Hall, “Ethnicities” 173, n. 8.

¹³. Cf. Hall, “Ethnicities” 171.

¹⁴. Cf. E. Badian, “Greeks and Macedonians”, in Beryl Bar-Sharrar – E. N. Borza (eds.), *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, Washington D.C. 1982, 33-51; *id.*, “Herodotus on Alexander I of Macedon: A Study in some Subtle Silences”, in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, Oxford 1994, 35-51; E. N. Borza, *In the Shadow of Olympus. The Emergence of Macedon*, Princeton, N.J. 1990¹; 1992²; *id.*, “Ethnicity and Cultural Policy at Alexander’s Court”, *AncW* 22 (1991) 21-25 (= *Makedonika* 149-58); *id.*, “The Philhellenism of Archelaos”, *Ancient Macedonia* V, Thessalonike 1993, 237-44 (= *Makedonika* 124-33); *id.*, “Greeks and Macedonians in the Age of Alexander: The Source Traditions”, in R. W. Wallace – E. M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian*, Norman, Okla.-London 1996, 122-39; *id.*, “La Macedonia di Filippo e i conflitti con le ‘poleis’”, in S. Setis (ed.), *I Greci. Storia, Cultura, Arte, Società* 2.3, Turin 1998, 21-46; *id.*, “Macedonia Redux”, in Frances B. Titchener – R. F. Moorton Jr. (eds.), *The Eye Expanded: Life and the Arts in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1999, 249-66, and particularly 263, n. 17; P. Green, *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*, Berkeley - Los Angeles 1990, 3-5; Sarah B. Pomeroy, S. M. Burstein *et al.*, *Ancient Greece: A Political, Social, and Cultural History*, New York - Oxford 1999, 373-75, etc.

¹⁵. Cf. Hall, *Identity* 63-65.

¹⁶. See C. Brixhe, “Un ‘nouveau’ champ de la dialectologie grecque: le macédonien”, *KATA ΔΙΑΔΕΚΤΟΝ. Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale di Dialettologia Greca, A.I.O.N.* 19 (1997) 41-71; Sophia Moschonisioti, A. Ph. Christides, Theodora Glaraki, “Κατάδεσμος ἀπε τῶν Ἀρέθουσα”, in A. Ph. Christides – D. Jordan (eds.), *Γλῶσσα καὶ μαγεία. Κείμενα ἀπε τῶν ἀρχαιότητα*, Athens 1997, 193-98; E. Voutiras, *ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΦΩΝΤΟΣ ΓΑΜΟΙ: Marital Life and Magic in Fourth Century Pella*, Amsterdam 1998; M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Epigraphie et philologie: récentes découvertes épigraphiques et gloses macédoniennes d’Hésychius”, *CRAI* (1998) 1189-1218; *id.*, “Le Macédonien: nouvelles données et théories nouvelles”, *Ancient Macedonia* V, Thessalonike 1999, 225-39; *id.*, “L’histoire par les noms’ in Macedonia”, in *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence, ProcBritAcad* 104 (2000) 99-117; *id.*, “La position dialectal du macédonien à la lumière des découvertes épigraphiques récentes”, *Die alte griechischen Dialekte, ihr Wesen und Werden* (forthcoming); *id.*, “Herodotos (VIII. 137-138), the Manumissions from Leukopetra, and the Topography of the Middle Haliakmomi Valley”, *The Word of Herodotus* (forthcoming).

¹⁷. This is the case of much of the fundamental archaeological and epigraphic scholarly production published in Greece, such as the fourteen volumes of *Το Αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και Θράκη*, 1-14 (1987-2000) series, the volumes of the *Επιγραφές Μακεδονίας* series and the seventeen volumes of the ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ series devoted to Macedonia, some of which have a direct bearing on the present subject.

¹⁸. For instance, the epigraphic discoveries mentioned in the previous notes have greatly reduced the importance of glosses and have rendered redundant much of the relevant discussion. In particular, *dreptos* (p. 162) is a ghost (see Anna Panayotou, “Γλωσσικὸς παρατηρήσεις σὲ μακεδονικὸς ἀπιγραφὸς”, *Ancient Macedonia* IV, Thessalonike 1986, 417). Strabo 7.7.8 (p. 163) does not say that Macedonians, Epirotes and Illyrians shared some dialectal commonalities. In fact he says two different things: 1) that some extend the term Macedonia to the whole country (west of Upper Macedonia) as far as Corcyra, because the inhabitants of this area (to wit the Epirotes opposite Corcyra and not the

Hall¹⁹ fully shares Malkin's view on the overriding importance of religion and in particular of common shrines and sacrifices²⁰, he does not exploit the unique evidence of the *theorodokoi* catalogues²¹, which precisely list the Greek states visited by the *theoroi*, the sacred envoys, of the panhellenic sanctuaries and invited to participate through official delegations in sacrifices and contests celebrated in those sanctuaries²².

It has long been established that the *theoroi* of the Panhellenic sanctuaries, did not visit mere urban centres, whatever their importance, but only states, be they of the *polis* or of the *ethnos* variety, for their mission consisted in announcing (ἀπαγγελλίαι) the sacred truce and the oncoming contests to the state authorities²³.

Since only Hellenes participated in the Panhellenic sacrifices and contests²⁴, it is obvious that the *theoroi* visited only communities which considered

Illyrians, who lived farther north, beyond the Ceraunian mountains), use similar hairstyles, dress and dialect (cf. R. Baladié, *Strabon, Géographie. Livre VII*, Paris 1989, 228, n. 4 *ad locum*; 2) some of the Epirotes inhabiting this area are bilingual (presumably they spoke Greek as well as Illyrian). Epigraphic evidence accumulating over the years has rendered Tarn's list of divinities and its discussion (p. 164) irrelevant. Thaulos, Gyga, Zeirene, Xandos, Bedu, Arantides, Sauadai, Sabazius never occur in epigraphic documents; Totoë's, attested once in Roman times, is an imported Egyptian deity (cf. H. Seyrig, "Tithoës, Totoë's et le Sphinx panthée", *Annales du Service des Antiquités d'Égypte* 35 (1935) 197-202; Ch. Picard, "La sphinge tricéphale, dite 'panthée', d'Amphipolis et la démonologie égypto-alexandrine", *CRAI* (1957) 35-46; id., "La sphinge tricéphale dite 'panthée', d'Amphipolis et la démonologie égypto-alexandrine", *Mon.Piot* 50 (1958) 49-84; Gazoria is a local epithet from the name of the eastern Macedonian city of Gazoros (cf. M. B. Hatzopoulos, "Artémis Agrotéra, Gazoreitis et Bloureitis: une déesse thrace en Macédoine", *Festschrift Ivan Marazov* [forthcoming]). Judging from dedicatory inscriptions, the most popular gods of the Macedonians were Zeus, Herakles, Asklepios, Dionysos and a feminine deity variously appearing as Demeter, the Mother of the Gods, Artemis, Pasikrata, Ennodia etc. Catherine Trümper's excellent monograph, *Untersuchungen zu den altgriechischen Monatsnamen und Monatsfolgen* (Heidelberg 1997) 262-65, has made obsolete previous discussions of the Macedonian calendar. For the months Peritios, Dystros and Hyperberetaios in particular, cf. Hatzopoulos, "Macédonien" 237-39; id., "Epigraphie" 1202-1204. Klodones and Mimalones (p. 176, n. 54) have nothing to do with Thrace; see M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Cultes et rites de passage en Macédoine* (MEAEETHMATA 19; Athens 1994) 73-85. On the political system of the Molossi (p. 166), cf. the divergent view of J. K. Davies, "A Wholly Non-Aristotelian Universe: The Molossians as Ethnos, State, and Monarchy", in R. Brock – St. Hodkinson (eds), *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, Oxford 2000, 258: "...so far from being un-Greek, as supercilious southerners thought, their world shows clear signs of similarity to that of the communities of southern Aegean and proto-urban Greece in the archaic period". Concerning the Aiolian ancestry of the Macedonians in Hellanicus' version, as opposed to the Dorian one of the royal dynasty (p. 169), it is not impossible that this Lesbian historian's invention may have stemmed from the contrast between the Upper Macedonian origin of the Argeads and the north-Thessalian one of the Lower Macedonian commoners; cf. Hatzopoulos, "Herodotos".

¹⁹ Hall, "Ethnicities" 72, n. 92.

²⁰ Malkin, "Introduction" 5-6.

²¹ See now Paula Perlman, *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece. The Theodorokia in the Peloponnese*, Göttingen 2000. For the Delphic catalogues, awaiting for the new edition by J. Ouhlen, *Les Théarodoques de Delphes* (doctoral dissertation, Université de Paris X, 1992), see A. Plassart, "Inscriptions de Delphes. La liste des théarodoques", *BCH* 45 (1921) 1-85. Its date in the late third century, first proposed by G. Daux, "Liste delphique de théarodoques"; *REG* 62 (1949) 12-27, has been confirmed by a series of new discoveries; cf. Ph. Gauthier, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes II*, Geneva 1989, 149-50; M. B. Hatzopoulos, "Un prêtre d'Amphipolis dans la grande liste des théarodoques de Delphes", *BCH* 115 (1991) 345-47; D. Knoepfler, "Le temple de Métroon de Sardes et ses inscriptions"; *Museum Helveticum* 50 (1993) 26-43.

²² Cf. Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* 472-76. This has been admirably done now by Manuela Mari in her monograph *Al di là dell'Olimpo: Macedoni e grandi santuari della Grecia dall'età arcaica al primo ellenismo* (MEAEETHMATA 34; Athens 2002).

²³ See in particular L. Robert, "Villes de Carie et d'Ionie dans la liste des théarodoques de Delphes", *BCH* 70 (1946) 510 (= *OMS* I 331); id., *Documents d'Asie Mineure*, Paris 1987, 292-95; cf. *BullEpigr* 1980, 297; cf. Perlman, *City* 32-33; ead., "ἠερωδοδοκοῦντες ἂν τὰς πόλειςιν. Panhellenic Epangelia and Political Status", in M. H. Hansen, *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State*, Copenhagen 1995, 113-47.

²⁴ This widely attested fact (cf. Herod. 5.22.1-2) has recently been commented upon by R. Parker, *Cleomenes on the Acropolis*, Oxford 1998, 10-11.

themselves and were considered by the others as Greek. Starting with one of the oldest catalogues, that of Epidauros, dating from 360, and continuing with those of Nemea, Argos, and Delphi, the Macedonian kingdom is never absent from their surviving North Aegean sections. At such an early date in the fourth century as that of the first one it cannot be claimed that the Macedonian presence was the result of the kingdom's political and military might. Nor can it be said that the invitation concerned only the "Greek" royal family, for, as we have already stressed, it was addressed not to individuals but to states²⁵.

One might object the "post-Philippian" date of the Nemea, Argos and Delphi lists. It is true that none of the three is earlier than the last quarter of the fourth century, but even the most recent one, the late third century great list of the *theorodokoi* of Delphi, following a long established tradition, includes, with very few and obvious exceptions, only the coastal, ἀρχαιόθεν ἑλληνίδες cities of Asia²⁶. Still for the sake of argument, we can start by considering only the list of Epidauros, which dates back to around 360, years before it could be argued that Macedonia by its meteoric rise had imposed itself on the terrorised personnel of the panhellenic sanctuaries²⁷.

The Epidaurian list, in its surviving sections, on a first stele, starting from Megara moves through Attica and Boeotia to Thessaly, Macedonia, Chalkidike and Thrace. On a second stele are listed the *theorodokoi* of Corinth, Delphi, Ozolian Lokris, Aitolia, Akarnania, Sicily and southern Italy. Of particular interest are the Macedonian (including Chalkidike) and Epirotic sections. In the first, after Thessalian Homolion, one reads the names of the *theorodokoi* of Pydna, Methone, Macedonia, Aineia, Dikaia, Poteidaia, Kalindoia, Olynthos, Apollonia, Arethousa, Arkilos, Amphipolis, Berga, Tragila, Stagira, Akanthos, Stolos, Aphytis, Skiona and Menda.

Fortunately we possess a contemporary document describing the same region, the work of Pseudo-Skylax²⁸. He describes the Macedonians as an *ethnos* after the Peneios, mentions the Thermaic Gulf, and lists Herakleion as the first city of Macedonia, then Dion, Pydna a Greek city, Methone a Greek city, the river Haliakmon, Aloros a city, the river Lydias, Pella a city and a palace in it and a waterway up the Lydias to it, the river Axios, the river Echedoros, Therme a city, Aineia a Greek city, Cape Pallene, and after an enumeration of the cities of Chalkidike, Arethousa a Greek city, Lake Bolbe, Apollonia a Greek city, and "many other cities of Macedonia in the interior".

As U. Kahrstedt was the first to understand, the distinction between "Greek cities" and "Macedonian cities" or simple "cities" is not ethnological but political. Independent cities are qualified as Greek, while the cities remaining within the Macedonian kingdom have to content themselves with the simple qualification of "cities"²⁹.

The list of the *theorodokoi* of Epidauros confirms the nature of this

²⁵. See now also Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, "Greek Perceptions of Ethnicity and the Ethnicity of the Macedonians", *Identinità e prassi storica nel Mediterraneo greco*, Milano 2002, 190-92.

²⁶. L. Robert, "Villes de Carie et d'Ionie dans la liste des théarodokes de Delphes", *BCH* 70 (1946) 515-16 (= *OMS* 336-37).

²⁷. *IG* V 1, 94-95; cf. Perlman, *City* 177-79; Ep. Cat. E. 1.

²⁸. Pseudo-Skylax 66.

²⁹. U. Kahrstedt, "Städte in Makedonien", *Hermes* 81 (1953) 91-111.

distinction, for in the section west of the head of the Thermaic Gulf it enumerates only three states: Pydna, Methone and Macedonia. Thus the first, although a city originally Macedonian³⁰, is called a “Greek city”, just like the originally Eretrian colony of Methone, because at the time they were both independent from the kingdom and members of the Second Athenian League, while the equally Macedonian Herakleion, Dion, Aloros and Pella were simply styled as “cities”. The Epidaurian *theorodokoi* visited only “Macedonia”, that is to say the capital of the state, presumably Pella or Aigeai, not because this was the only Greek city of the kingdom and even less because they intended to invite the king only –the invitation, as we have seen, was extended to communities not to persons–, but because there was the seat of the authorities to whom the *epangelia* had to be made, as at that time, before the reforms of Philip II, the several Macedonian cities did not possess sufficient political latitude to qualify as autonomous cities and to be eligible to participate *as such* in panhellenic festivals³¹.

Similarly the section Epirus lists the states of Pandosia, Kassopa, Thesprotoi, Poionos, Korkyra, Chaonia, Artichia, Molossoi, Ambrakia, Argos (of Amphilochia). Of these the Elean colony of Pandosia and the Corinthian colonies of Korkyra and Ambrakia represent the southern Greek element, while Kassopa, the Thesprotoi, the Molossoi, Chaonia and Argos the “native” Epirote one. (Nothing is known of Poionos and Artichia). The important point is that colonial cities, Epirote cities and Epirote *ethne*, republican and monarchical alike, are considered equally Greek and invited to the great panhellenic sacrifices at Epidauros.

The same picture emerges from the slightly later lists of Argos³² and Nemea³³ and from the late third century list of Delphi, the main difference being that after Philip II’s reforms the several Macedonian cities take the place of the central Macedonian authorities³⁴, while Epirus wavers between a single centralised and several civic representations.

A piece of evidence which until very recently had gone unnoticed is the actual presence of Macedonians and Epirotes in the panhellenic sanctuaries, which is first attested in the Archaic period, but increases dramatically in the second half of the fourth century. Alexander I was neither the first nor the only Macedonian active at a panhellenic sanctuary in the fifth century. He had been preceded at Delphi by Macedonians from Pieria, and both his fifth century successors Perdikkas II and Archelaos participated in panhellenic festivals at Olympia,

³⁰. The relevant information in the literary sources (Thuc. 1.137.1 and Diod. 11.12.3) has been confirmed by recent epigraphic and other archaeological discoveries. Cf. M. Bessios, “Ανασκαφή στο βόρειο νεκροταφείο της Πύδνας”, *AEMΘ* 3 (1989) 155-63; J. B. Cuberna – D. Jordan, “Curse Tablets from Pydna”, (forthcoming).

³¹. Cf. Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 473.

³². From Argos we have a fragmentary list (P. Charneux, “Liste argienne de Théarodoques”, *BCH* 90 [1966] 156-88; Perlman, *City* 100-104, Ep. Cat. A. 1) dating from c. 334-325/4 and preserving the names of the *theorodokoi* from north-western Greece, the Peloponnese, and western Asia Minor and the Aegean islands, and a fragmentary list preserving the amounts of contributions from Thessaly and Macedonia, probably related to the expenses of the sacred envoys, and dating from the end of the fourth century (*IG* IV 617; cf. Perlman, *City* 127-29).

³³. S. G. Miller, “The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games”, *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 147-63; Perlman, *City* 236-39, Ep. Cat. N. 1. The fragmentary catalogue probably dates from c. 321-317 (Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* 474, n. 7) and preserves the names of the *theorodokoi* of Cyprus, Akarnania, the Ionian Islands, Macedonia, the Hellespont, Kyme, Eretria and Chios.

³⁴. Cf. Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 472-86.

Delphi or Argos³⁵.

It is in this context that we can properly understand some other facts that have puzzled modern historians, such as the participation of Macedonian envoys in the panhellenic conference held at Sparta in 371³⁶ or the inclusion of the Macedonian *ethnos* –and not just king Philip– in the Delphic Amphictiony³⁷. Under these conditions Demosthenes' outrage at the presence of Philip II and his Macedonians at Delphi loses much of its candour and credibility³⁸. As J. Hall rightly observes, the rhetorical contrast between Greeks and Macedonians in the age of Alexander, by which some American scholars set much store, “has military-political rather than ethnic connotations”³⁹. A case in point is the list of Alexander the Great's trierarchs in Arrian's *Indica*, which E. N. Borza, labouring to demonstrate the un-Hellenic character of the ancient Macedonians, adduced *inter alia* in an article in honour of E. Badian⁴⁰.

“The men appointed by Alexander to command the Hydaspes River”, he writes, “are named according to their ethnicity: ‘these were the Macedonians altogether: as for the Greeks ...’ (οὔτοι μὲν οἱ ξύμπαντες Μακεδόνες. Ἑλλήνων δὲ...). Arrian concludes by mentioning the appointment of a single Persian, thus preserving the distinction among Macedonians, Greeks, and others, as mentioned elsewhere (2.17.4 and 7.30.2-3). I regard the μὲν... δὲ usage as significant”⁴¹.

The list of the trierarchs is admittedly an interesting document and the μὲν... δὲ... usage is indeed significant, provided they are accurately reported and correctly analysed. In reality, to the μὲν of the Macedonians are opposed not one but two δὲ (Οὔτοι μὲν οἱ ξύμπαντες Μακεδόνες. Ἑλλήνων δὲ... Κυπρίων δὲ...), followed by the single Persian (αὐτὸς δὲ δὲ καὶ Πέρσης...). Thus Arrian, or rather his source, distinguishes (if we leave aside the odd Persian), between three groups: the Macedonians, the Greeks and the Cypriots. The next point which arises concerns the exact nature of this distinction. Borza has no doubt that it relates to the “ethnicity” of these men. He explains that he uses this term “to describe a cultural identity that is near the meaning of *nationality*, but without the necessity of membership in a political organism...” and proposes to use as criteria “language, contemporary perceptions,

³⁵. See the new monograph by Manuela Mari, (*Olimpo* 29-66). Imaginative scenarios about Archelaos' and the other Macedonian kings' exclusion from the panhellenic shrines and the creation of counter-Olympics at Dion (cf. Badian “Greeks” 35; Borza, “Archelaos” 129) not only are explicitly contradicted by the unique available literary source (Solinus 9.16), but are also implicitly refuted by epigraphic evidence such as the Epidauros list and the inscribed tripod from the great tomb of Vergina (M. Andronikos, *Vergina: The Royal Tombs*, Athens 1984, 165-66; see now Mari, *Olimpo* 35-36). From Epirus too, in the first half of the sixth century, the Molossian Alkon had been present at the Olympic Games along with other young Greek nobles (Herod. 6.127.4; cf. Cabanes, *Les Illyriens* 24; Malkin, “Ambiguities” 201).

³⁶. Aesch. 2.32; cf. Badian, “Greeks” 37 with n. 28; N. G. L. Hammond, “Literary Evidence for Macedonian Speech”, *Historia* 43 (1994) 134-35 (= *Collected Studies* IV 80-81).

³⁷. P. Marchetti, “A propos des comptes de Delphes sous les archontats de Théon (324/3) et de Laphis (327/6)”, *BCH* 101 (1977) 14, n. 37; N. G. L. Hammond, “Some Passages in Arrian Concerning Alexander”, *CQ* 30 (1980) 462-63; *id.*, “Were *Makedones* Enrolled in the Amphictyonic Council in 346?”, *Electronic Antiquity* 1/3 (1993). See now F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie pyléodelphique: histoire et institutions*, Paris 1998, 94-101; Mari, *Olimpo* 71, n. 4.

³⁸. Dem., 19. 327.

³⁹. Hall, “Ethnicities” 173, n. 8.

⁴⁰. Cf. though Badian, “Greeks” 39-40 and 49, n. 50, who is much more cautious in his discussion of that particular passage.

⁴¹. Borza, “Greeks” 125.

historical perceptions, and cultural institutions”⁴².

As I recently wrote in a different context⁴³, the case of the Macedonians is bound to remain paradoxical as long as it is viewed by itself. I then had in mind the parallel case of Epirus, which was geographically excluded from Greece and whose inhabitants from the time of Thucydides to that of Strabo were qualified as barbarians, even from the linguistic point of view, although they undoubtedly spoke a Greek dialect that we have no difficulty in understanding, enjoyed Greek institutions and shared, as we have seen, the same shrines and sacrifices and participated in the same panhellenic events as the other Greeks⁴⁴. In their case, the reason for the occasional and paradoxical denial of their Hellenism is probably to be sought in the absence before the Hellenistic period of urban centres deserving the name and status of *poleis*⁴⁵. The Cypriot case, however, is equally instructive.

An overview of the evidence concerning Cyprus, which I reserve for fuller treatment elsewhere⁴⁶, would lead us to the conclusion that, whatever the physical appearance of ancient Cypriots⁴⁷, it did not cast any doubts on the Hellenic origin of the kingdoms of the island, on the Greek character of the local dialect or on the Hellenic nature of the gods venerated there with the only –and obvious– exceptions of the Phoenician city of Kition and of the “autochthonous” one of Amathous.

The Cypriot syllabic script was indeed an obstacle to written communication, but from the middle of the fourth century the use of the Greek alphabet spreads across the island⁴⁸. For oral communication the Cypriot dialect probably sounded exotic –then as now– to some –but not all–⁴⁹ Greek speakers from the Aegean area. But then many Greeks were aware of the existence of other Greeks with uncouth tongues. Did Thucydides not write that the Eurytians “speak a most incomprehensible tongue”⁵⁰ and has it not been said of the Eleans that they are “speakers of a barbarous tongue”⁵¹? Nonetheless, at least as far as practical policies are concerned, the Greekness of neither of them was ever contested. Sacred prostitution assuredly shocked more than one Greek. But it was in no way a Cypriot monopoly. The Epizephyrian Locrians, for instance, reputedly followed the same practice⁵². The Cypriot kingships, whatever their exact origin and nature, were for most city-state Greeks an anomaly. But monarchies had survived in Cyrenaica and the northern fringes of the Greek world or had reappeared in Sicily. Thus, no single criterion can satisfactorily explain the exclusion of the

⁴². *Op.cit.*, 136, n. 2.

⁴³. M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Prefazione” in Mari, *Olimpo* 9-10.

⁴⁴. M. B. Hatzopoulos, “The Boundaries of Hellenism in Epirus during Antiquity”, in M. B. Sakellariou (ed.), *Epirus*, Athens 1997, 140-42.

⁴⁵. Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* I 473, n. 4.

⁴⁶. M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Epirus, Macedonia, Cyprus and Other Controverted Cases of Greek Identity* (ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ; forthcoming); cf. P. J. Stylianou, *The Age of the Kingdoms. A Political History of Cyprus in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (“Μελέται καὶ Ἀπομνημόνευτα” II; Nicosia 1989) 492 [117]-510 [136].

⁴⁷. Cf. G. Hill, *History of Cyprus*, vol. I, Cambridge 1949, 93-94.

⁴⁸. Cf. O. Masson, *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques*, Paris 1983², 46-47.

⁴⁹. For instance, not to the Arcadians.

⁵⁰. Thuc. 3.94.5.

⁵¹. Hesych. s.v. βαρβαρόφωνοι.

⁵². Ath., *Deipn.* 12.516a.

Cypriots from the Greek community in the list of Alexander the Great's trierarchs, but not from participation in panhellenic sacrifices and contests, as the *theorodokoi* lists attest. For, whatever the conditions in earlier periods, it seems that by the last quarter of the fourth century most Greeks and apparently all foreigners recognised the Cypriots as Greeks⁵³.

The unsatisfactory results of our inquiry oblige us to question the validity of the premisses on which it was based, to wit that Alexander's trierarchs "are named according to their ethnicity", as Borza thought. An obvious anomaly should have made us suspicious. The list of the Macedonian trierarchs comprises at least two persons whose impeccable Greek "ethnicity"⁵⁴ the American historian would readily recognise: Nearchos son of Androtimos and Laomedon son of Larichos hailing respectively from the Cretan city of Lato and the Lesbian city of Mytilene. Borza makes no mention of this difficulty in his comment on the list, but attempts to deal with the first case in a note referring to a different context, hesitating between casting doubts on the reliability of the list⁵⁵ and on that of Nearchos' origin⁵⁶. In fact, just as the presence of the "forgotten" category of the Cypriots contradicts the alleged binary opposition between Greeks on the one hand and Macedonians on the other, discrepancies such as the above belie the supposed "ethnic" character of the list and cannot be explained, unless the latter reflects "nationality", "Staatsangehörigkeit", rather than "ethnicity". Borza, who sets great store by the case of Eumenes' handicap as an "ethnic" Greek, despite his long years in Macedonian service, could not convincingly argue that Nearchos and Laomedon and thousands of other Greeks from beyond Olympus ceased to be "ethnic" Greeks –whatever that may mean– when they settled in Macedonia⁵⁷.

The explanation of the presence of Nearchos and Laomedon in the Macedonian list is obvious: contrary to Eumenes, when they moved to Macedonia, they did not simply settle in the country, but became citizens of Amphipolis and *ipso facto* also of the Macedonian Commonwealth.

It is thus more than clear that the trierarchs are not "named according to ethnicity". The classification is determined by political criteria. All citizens of Macedonian civic units are classified as Macedonians, whatever their origin. Who then are the Greeks? Medios son of Oxythemis from Larissa, Eumenes son of Hieronymos from Kardia, Kritoboulos son of Platon from Kos, Thoas son of Menodoros and Maiandros son Mandrogenes from Magnesia, Andron son of Kabeles from Teos. Now, the home cities of these trierarchs share a common feature: they were all members of the Hellenic League (of which Macedon itself

⁵³. Cf. Perlman, *City* 115-16.

⁵⁴. The word "ethnicity", as already mentioned, is practically untranslatable in languages such as Greek, German or French, except as a calque from English. Its success in the latter language, and in particular in American English, is probably due to the shift in meaning of the term "nation" in a country without a long national tradition, which, instead of the people, came to be used for the "state", causing the need for the creation of a new term. For a Greek the existence of an ἔθνος or for a German the existence of a "nation" is clearly independent from that of a state apparatus.

⁵⁵. "Nearchos is mentioned among the notables, but Arrian (rather than Nearchos himself, *Ind.* 18.4) classifies him among the Macedonians" (Borza, "Greeks" 137-38, n. 14).

⁵⁶. "While *probably* of Cretan origin..." (Borza, "Greeks" 138, n. 14, my italics). It is not a question of probability but of certainty based on both literary and epigraphical evidence (cf. H.Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* I-II, Munich 1926, 269, no 544).

⁵⁷. Cf. Badian, "Greeks" 39-40 and 49, n. 48-50.

was no part), Larissa and Kardia from the time of Philip II⁵⁸, Kos and Magnesia and Teos since 332⁵⁹. On the other hand the kingdoms of Cyprus, which joined Alexander at the siege of Tyre, never adhered to the League officially styled as “the Hellenes”.

A closer look at other passages collected and adduced by Borza as supposedly revelatory of the –“ethnic” that is to say, according to him (*vide supra*), of the cultural– distinction between Greeks and Macedonians betrays similar difficulties and discrepancies. As M. B. Sakellariou has aptly stressed, the contrast and occasionally the antagonism between Greeks and Macedonians in the age of Philip and Alexander, of which the American historian makes so much, was political and had to a certain extent social causes⁶⁰. In fact the Macedonians satisfied the criteria of Greekness put forward by the Athenians in their celebrated answer to the Spartan envoys, as it is reported by Herodotus⁶¹. Nevertheless, it is equally true that their Hellenic quality was recurrently disputed, especially when political animosities created a suitable political environment. For the opposition was political and doubly so, between *polis*-states and an *ethnos*-state, as well as between regimes which ideally were democratic and a reputedly tyrannic monarchy. Thus, even for pro-Macedonians wanting to dispel legitimate fears that the Macedonian kings might extend their monarchical regime to the Greek cities, it was important to dissociate as much as possible the Temenid kingdom from the world of the *polis*-states. This was the reason why Isokrates, eager to reassure his readers that a Macedonian hegemony was not dangerous for their liberties, insisted that, just as Philip’s ancestors, knowing that the Greeks could not suffer monarchical regimes, rather than enslave their fellow citizens, preferred to leave Greece altogether and rule over a different (οέχ ἱμοφύλου γένους) people⁶², so Philip himself would not dream of imposing his rule on the Greeks, but would content himself with reigning over the Macedonians⁶³. In this often-cited passage the Athenian orator masterfully exploits the implicit correspondence between the geographical term ἑλληνικες τόπος and the ethnic ≠Ελλην, from which it derives, in order to enforce in the mind of his readers the un-Hellenic character of οἱ ἄλλοι, the subjects of the Macedonian kings, since for most writers of the Classical and Hellenistic periods⁶⁴ Hellas did not extend

⁵⁸. N. G. L. Hammond – G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. II, Oxford 1979, 381.

⁵⁹. E. Badian, “Alexander and the Greeks of Asia”, *Ancient Societies and Institutions. Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg*, Oxford 1966, 37-96.

⁶⁰ M. B. Sakellariou, “The Inhabitants”, in M. B. Sakellariou (ed.), *Macedonia*, Athens 1983, 52; cf. Hall, “Ethnicities” 173, n. 8.

⁶¹. Herod. 144.2.

⁶². Given the obvious opportunism of the passage, it is vain to delve into the exact meaning of the term, which in Greek has meanings as varied as the word φύλον, from which it is composed. In any case, it is noteworthy that it can be used to denote not necessarily another “race” or “nation”, but just another Greek population (cf. Thuc. 1.141, aptly adduced by Daskalakis, *Hellenism* 274, n. 56.).

⁶³. Isocr., *Phil* 107-108: ἰ δὲ τὴν μὲν τὸ πῶς τὴν ἑλληνικὴν ἡλῶς ἐ-ασε, τὴν δ’ ἂν Μακεδονίᾳ βασιλείαν κατασχεῶν ἀπεθύμησεν· ἀπίστατο γὰρ τοῖς μὲν ≠Ελληνας οὐκ ἐπιτιμῶμενους ἐπιτιμῶμεν τὰς μοναρχίας· τοῖς δ’ ἄλλοις οὐκ ἐπιτιμῶμενους, ὅθεν τῆς τοιαύτης δυναστείας διοικεῶν τὴν βίον τὴν σφέτερον ἀτίῃν ... μόνος γὰρ τῶν ἑλλήνων, οὐκ ἱμοφύλου γένους ἀξιώσας ὄρχειν, μόνος καὶ διαφυγεῶν τοῖς κινδύνους τοῖς περὶ τὰς μοναρχίας γιγνομένων. Cf. Daskalakis, *Hellenism* 249-56.

⁶⁴. Cf. Ephor. *FGrHist* 70 frg 143; Pseudo-Skylax 33; 65; 66; Dion. Calliph. 24 and 31-36.

geographically beyond the Ambracian Gulf and the river Peneios⁶⁵. It is not excluded that the Macedonian king himself shared the Athenian orator's concern, and that, heeding his advice, he preferred to keep his kingdom completely apart from the Hellenic League⁶⁶. It should then not come as a surprise that the modern scholars who have best understood the Macedonian paradox are the nineteenth and early twentieth century Germans, who were aware of the particular position of Prussia vis-à-vis the rest of Germany, initially outside the borders of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation and, even after the abolition of the latter, an entity whose citizens were to be reckoned separately from the other Germans⁶⁷. Did not Jakob Salomon Bartholdy write in such terms to his brother-in-law Abraham Mendelssohn on 6 February 1817: "Als ich hier (in Neapel) kam, fand ich viele deutsche und preussische Künstler von entschiedenem Anlagen und Talenten", and can one not still in 1990 publish a book under the title *Preussen und Deutschland gegenüber dem Novemberaufstand 1830-1831*? Does not the reluctance of the South German states to submit to Prussia, and at the same time the Prussian king's desire to maintain direct and exclusive hold on his own kingdom, for which reason William I styled himself "Deutscher Kaiser, König von Preussen" rather than "Kaiser der Deutschen" in 1871, ring Isocratic echoes?

ABBREVIATIONS

- Badian, "Greeks" = E. Badian, "Greeks and Macedonians", in Beryl Bar-Sharrar – E. N. Borza (ed.), *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (Washington D.C. 1982) 33-51.
 Borza, "Archelaos" = E. N. Borza, "The Philhellenism of Archelaos", *Ancient Macedonia V* (Thessalonike 1993) 237-44 (= *Makedonika* 124-33).
 Borza, "Greeks" = E. N. Borza, "Greeks and Macedonians in the Age of Alexander: The Source Traditions", in R. W. Wallace – E. M. Harris (eds.), *Transitions to Empire. Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360-146 B.C. in Honor of E. Badian* (Norman, Okla. - London 1996) 122-39.
 Daskalakis, *Hellenism* = Ap. Daskalakis, *The Hellenism of the Ancient Macedonians* (Thessalonike 1965).
 Hall, "Ethnicities" = J. Hall, "Contested Ethnicities: Perceptions of Macedonia

⁶⁵. Nearly a century and a half later a Macedonian King, in a sarcastic repartee (Pol. 18.5. 7-9: "ποίας δὲ κελεύετε με" φησὶν ἄκχωρεῖν Ἑλλάδος καὶ πῶς ἀφορίζετε ταύτην; ἀέτιν γὰρ Ἀἰτωλῶν οὐκ εἶσδν Ἕλληνας οἱ πλείους· τε γὰρ τῶν Ἀγρῶν ὄθνος καὶ τε τῶν Ἀποδωτῶν, ὅτι δὲ τῶν Ἀμφιλόχων, οὐκ ὅστιν Ἑλλάς ἢ τούτων μὲν παραχωρεῖτέ μοι;") exploited the same ambiguity in order to stress the absurdity of the proposed exclusion of Macedonia from Greece. Cf. le commentaire de P. Cabanes, "Cité et ethnos dans la Grèce ancienne", *Mélanges P. Lévêque II*, Paris 1989, 75: "Suivre cette voie qui conduit à l'exclusion de la Grèce d'une très grande région de la Grèce septentrionale, c'est aussi écarter de l'hellénisme aussi bien l'Olympe cher aux dieux du panthéon des Hellènes que le sanctuaire de Dodone, déjà visité au temps de l'*Iliade*, et le pays des morts arrosé par l'Archéron et le Cocyte réunis à proximité du *Nekromanteion* d'Ephyre de Thesprotie, où Ulysse vient à la rencontre du devin Tiresias, selon le récit de l'*Odyssée*".

⁶⁶. Which proved to be a mistake, for it enabled anti-Macedonian politicians to construe a Hellenic identity from which Macedonia was excluded.

⁶⁷. See in particular, F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II*, Munich and Berlin 1930, 32: "Nicht anders steht es mit dem Hinweis darauf, dass die Makedonen sich namentlich in der Zeit Alexanders des Grossen und der Diadochen als ein Volk für sich gefühlt hätten: Dieses Gefühl war lediglich ein Ausfluss nationalen Stolzes auf die unerhörten Leistungen, die ihnen die östliche Welt zu Füßen gelegt hatte, eine Wirkung des stolzen Bewusstseins, auch den Griechen militärisch und politisch unendlich überlegen zu sein. Ganz ähnlich haben sich die Preussen zur Zeit Friedrichs des Grossen allen anderen Deutschen gegenüber als ein besonderes Volk gefühlt, haben sich mit Stolz als Preussen und nicht als Deutschen bekannt".

- within Evolving Greek Identity”, in I. Malkin, (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, Mass. - London 2001) 159-86.
- Hall, “Language”, = J. Hall, “The Role of Language in Greek Ethnicities”, *ProcCamPhilSoc* 41 (1995) 83-100.
- Hatzopoulos, “Epigraphie” = M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Epigraphie et philologie: récentes découvertes épigraphiques et gloses macédoniennes d’Hesychius”, *CRAI* (1998) 1189-1218.
- Hatzopoulos, “Herodotos” = M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Herodotos (VIII 137-138), the Manumissions from Leukopetra, and the Topography of the Middle Haliakmon Valley”, *The World of Herodotus* (forthcoming).
- Hatzopoulos, “Macédonien” = M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Le macédonien: nouvelles données et théories nouvelles”, *Ancient Macedonia VI* (Thessalonike 1999) 225-39.
- Hatzopoulos, *Institutions* = M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings: A Historical and Epigraphic Study* (= *MEAETHMATA* 22; Athens 1996).
- Malkin, “Ambiguities” = I. Malkin, “Greek Ambiguities: Between ‘Ancient Hellas’ and ‘Barbarian Epirus’ ”, in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, Mass. - London 2001) 187-212.
- Malkin, “Introduction” = I. Malkin, “Introduction”, in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, Mass. - London 2001) 1-28.
- Mari, *Olimpo* = Manuela Mari, *Al di là dell’Olimpo: Macedoni e grandi santuari della Grecia dell’età arcaica al primo ellenismo* (*MEAETHMATA* 34; Athens 2002).
- Perlman, *City* = Paula Perlman, *City and Sanctuary in Ancient Greece: The Theorodokia in the Peloponnese* (Göttingen 2000).
- Thomas, “Ethnicity” = Rosalind Thomas, “Ethnicity, Genealogy, and Hellenism in Herodotus”, in I. Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, Mass. - London 2001) 213-33.

CHAPTER 2

MACEDONIA AND MACEDONIANS

M. B. Hatzopoulos

The geographical term Macedonia means nothing else but the land inhabited and/or ruled by the Macedonians. Its extent has followed the expansion of the Macedonian kingdom from its foundation around 700 BC to its suppression by the Romans in 168 BC. That is why it is impossible to give a single geographical definition of its limits. In the five centuries of its existence Macedonia proper (excluding the external fluctuating dependencies never integrated into the state) came to comprise the lands from the Pindus mountain range in the west to the plain of Philippi in the east, and from Mt. Olympus in the south to the Axios gorge between Mt. Barnous (Kaimaktsalan) and Mt. Orbelos (Beles) to the north. Almost ninety percent of its lands fall within the present-day borders of Greece, of which it is the northernmost province.¹

The Macedonians were not the first inhabitants of the country to which they eventually gave their name. Ancient literary sources mention the Pieres in Pieria, the Brygoi, remnants of a people who migrated to Asia Minor, where they are known under the name of the Phrygians, the mysterious Bottiaians, who allegedly hailed from Crete and Athens, Pelasgians in Emathia, the Almopes in Almopia, the Eordoi in Eordaia, Paionians along the Axios, and further east the Mygdonians, Edonians, Bisaltai, and Krestonians.² Our ignorance of the languages spoken by them—except for the Brygoi/Phrygians³—does not allow us to determine their precise habitat, and even less their ethnic affinities. All these population groups,

¹ On the question of the definition of Macedonia, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, "Les limites de la Macédoine antique," *Πρακτικά τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν* 70 (1995), 164–77 (in Greek with a French abstract); id., *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, 1, (MEΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ) 22 (Athens, 1996), pp. 167–216 and map I at the end of the volume.

² The main sources for Macedonia before the Macedonians are Thuc. 2.99; Strab. 7, fr. 11; Just. 7.1. For the Bottiaians in particular, see Plut., *Thes.*, 16.2–3 and *Mor.*, 299A.

³ For a survey of the Phrygian language, see Cl. Brixhe, "Le Phrygien," in Françoise Bader, ed., *Langues indo-européennes* (Paris, 1994), pp. 156–78.

whatever their origin, were either expelled or reduced to a subordinate position and eventually assimilated by the conquering Macedonians.⁴

The origin of the Macedonians themselves has, for more than a century, been the object of a lively debate, in which scientific considerations are sometimes inextricably intermingled with ulterior motives of a political nature. Macedonian authors, like most Greek writers of the late classical and Hellenistic period, used the Attic *koine* instead of their local dialect, while conclusive epigraphic evidence concerning the ancient Macedonian speech was not forthcoming. Inscriptions discovered in Macedonia were both rare and late, dating from after the reign of Philip II, who had introduced the Attic *koine* as the official idiom of his administration. We therefore had to rely on the contradictory evidence of ancient authors, who may have not been immune to political considerations when they stressed the common origin and common language of the Macedonians and the other Greeks or when they denied it. As for the collection of glosses, that is rare words attributed by ancient authors to various foreign and Greek peoples, among which feature the Macedonians, their *ex hypothesi* exotic nature and the uncertainty of the manuscript tradition deprives them of a large measure of their value as evidence.⁵

In the last thirty years the discovery, systematic collection and publication of a large number of inscriptions, sometimes of an early date, has made it possible to study in perspective proper names and technical terms that preserve phonetic and morphological features, as well as their divergences from the norms of the *koine*. Very recently a couple of longer texts entirely written in the local idiom have come to light and been published. They leave no doubt that Macedonian was a Greek dialect presenting affinities partly with the dialects attested in the inscriptions of Thessaly and partly with those known from documents discovered in north-western Greece. Moreover its phonology seems to have been influenced to a limited extent by the languages of the conquered peoples, in which the distinction between voiced and unvoiced consonants tended to be blurred.

⁴ For all these questions, see exhaustively N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, 2 (Oxford, 1972), pp. 405–41.

⁵ On the speech of the ancient Macedonians, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, *La Macédoine. Géographie historique, langue, cultes et croyances, institutions* (Paris, 2006), pp. 35–51, with bibliography.

Although it is true that Philip succeeded in fusing the different populations within his kingdom into a single people,⁶ the study of the *onomasticon* reveals that until the conquest of Macedonia by the Romans, the army, and therefore that part of the population which possessed full political rights, were descendants of the group of transhumant shepherds who had founded the Argead kingdom, or had assimilated to them.⁷

The cradle of the Argead kingdom of Lower Macedonia consisted of the vast alluvial plain formed by the rivers Haliacmon, Loudias and Axios, and the smaller one of Pieria (Katerini), along with the foothills of the mountains surrounding them: Mt. Olympus, the Pierian mountains, Mt. Bermion, and Mt. Barnous. The centre of the great plain, called in antiquity Bottia or Emathia, was until the beginning of the last century occupied by marshes and lake Loudiake, which was connected to the sea by the river Loudias.

West of Mt. Bermion extended Upper Macedonia, a series of mountainous uplands, each forming an independent kingdom: Elimeia on the middle Haliacmon valley, Orestis on the upper Haliacmon basin and around lake Kastoria, Lynceus in the present plain of Florina. With the exception of Eordaia, the basin of the lakes Begorritis and Petron, these regions were definitively annexed to the Argead kingdom only during the course of the fourth century BC. Further to the West Tymphaia-Paravaia and Atintania straddled the Pindus range forming both a boundary and a transition area between Macedonia and Epirus.

The "New Territories" east of the Axios were gradually annexed by the consistent efforts of a series of kings from Alexander I to Philip II. They included in the centre Mygdonia, the land corridor around lakes Pyrrolia (Koroneia) and Bolbe; to the north the inland plain of Crestonia; to the south the valley of Anthemous, the northern and southern Bottike, around the cities of Kalindoia and Spartolos respectively, and Chalcidice with its three prongs thrusting far into the Aegean; further east and along the Strymon, from north to south, Sintike on the gorge of the river, Bisaltia,

⁶ Cf. Just. 8.6.1–2: *Alios populos in finibus ipsis hostibus opponit; alios in extremis statuit; quosdam bello captos in supplementis urbium dividit. Atque ita ex multis gentibus nationibusque unum regnum populumque constituit.*

⁷ On the value of the *onomasticon* as historical evidence in the case of Macedonia, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, "L'histoire par les noms' in Macedonia," in S. Hornblower and Elaine Matthews, eds., *Greek Personal Names. Their Value as Evidence* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 99–117. On the relation between military service and full political rights, see Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 1, p. 209, n. 1; id., *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides: problèmes anciens et documents nouveaux*, (MEΛETHMATA) 30 (Athens, 2001), pp. 102–7.

Odomantike and Edonis and, by the sea, Pieris. The plain of Philippi, although under Macedonian rule, remained outside Macedonia proper until the reign of the last Antigonids.⁸

Two major communication routes, which were later to become Roman roads, provided a certain unity to this—by Greek standards—overextended state. The first connected the Danube basin with the Thermaic Gulf and southern Greece beyond through the Morava and the Axios valleys. The second, the famous Via Egnatia of the Romans, linked from west to east the Greek colonies of Apollonia and Dyrrhachium on the Adriatic Sea to the gates of Asia, Byzantium and Sestos, on the Bosphorus and the Hellespont respectively. These royal roads were laid and measured in stadia by the Macedonian administration.⁹

To modern Greeks of the south, Macedonia is an exotic country. The traveller who penetrates the valley of Tempe to enter Pieria discovers a land the scale of which, if not the nature, is completely different. He is greeted by the permanent snows of Mt. Olympus, the highest mountain of Greece (2917 m). Straight roads lined with lofty poplars take him across vast plains watered by all-season rivers, whose banks are grazed not only by sheep and goats, but also by cows and buffalo. Olive trees are no longer a typical feature of the landscape, but can be seen only near the coast. As he ascends into the uplands, he encounters forests of oak, beech, fir, and even birch. Although lion and wild ox, once the favourite trophies of royal hunts, no longer haunt its hills and valleys, the deer, the lynx, the wolf, and the bear still resist the attacks of modern civilisation. Over the vast stretches of lakes Prespa and Begorritis fly swans, storks, and pelicans, while in their depths swarm freshwater fish.

⁸ For a detailed account of the expansion of the Macedonian kingdom, see Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 1, pp. 167–216. In the absence of a recent comprehensive study of Upper Macedonia incorporating the very important archaeological finds of the last thirty years, see Hammond, Griffith, *History*, 2, pp. 102–23.

⁹ On the Macedonian section of the Via Egnatia, see Lucrèce Gounaropoulou and M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Les milliaires de la Voie Egnatienne entre Héraclée des Lyncestes et Thessalonique*, (MEΛETHMATA) 1 (Athens, 1985); I. Lolos, *Ἐγνατία Ὀδοῦς* (Athens, 2008). On the South-North axis, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Strepsa: A Reconsideration or New Evidence on the Road System of Lower Macedonia,” in M. B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa Loukopoulou, *Two Studies in Ancient Topography*, (MEΛETHMATA) 2 (Athens, 1987), pp. 19–53. For the organization of the communication system under the Macedonian kings, see Chaido Koukouli-Chrysanthaki, “A propos des voies de communication du royaume de Macédoine,” in Regula Frei-Stolba and Kristine Gex, eds., *Recherches récentes sur le monde hellénistique* (Bern etc., 2001), pp. 53–64.

This twenty-first century picture of Macedonia is not very different from the one which met the eyes of travellers in Classical antiquity, such as Demosthenes and Aeschines on their way from Athens to Pella. The civilizing action of a series of Argead kings had to a large extent domesticated the hard and dangerous country into which their ancestors had roamed with their flocks at the beginning of the seventh century BC.¹⁰

In effect, according to legend, the Macedonian kingdom was founded by Perdiccas, a descendent of Temenus, the first Heraclid king of Argos, who along with his two elder brothers had migrated to the Macedonian uplands and had gone into service tending the sheep and goats of a local king.¹¹ It was under the guidance of these goats that he allegedly occupied the site of Aegae (modern Vergina), which was to become the capital of his kingdom.¹² These founding legends, together with parallels drawn from observation of the pastoral people of modern Balkans, suggest that the first Macedonians were a group of Greek-speaking transhumant shepherds, closely related to the Magnesians of Thessaly.¹³ Having over the centuries moved around the summer pastures of Mt. Olympus and the Pierian mountains, and the winter pastures of the plains of Pieria and Emathia, it seems that they came under the authority of a clan hailing from the mountain range of Pindus, and that under their guidance they took possession of the strategic site of Aegae and settled there.¹⁴

Literary texts, inscriptions and coins, all confirm that transhumant pasturing of goats and sheep, together with the breeding of cows and horses in the plains watered by the great rivers Haliacmon, Loudias, Echedoros, Axios, and Strymon, continued to be one of the main activities of the Macedonians until the end of antiquity and beyond. Transhumance requires discipline and courage to control the movement of the animals and deal with the dangers involved. Encounters with wild beasts and hostile humans cannot have been unusual during the migrations across the mountain wilderness. It was accordingly an excellent school for a nation of hunters and warriors.¹⁵ Our sources inform us that a young Macedonian

¹⁰ Cf. N. G. L. Hammond, *The Macedonian State* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 152–4.

¹¹ Hdt. 8.137–8.

¹² Diod. 7.16; Euphorion fr. 30 (Schweidweiler); schol. In Clem. Alex., *Protr.*, 2.11; Just. 7.1.7–10.

¹³ Cf. Hes., *Eoëae*, fr. 7.

¹⁴ M. B. Hatzopoulos, "Herodotos (8.137–8), the Manumissions from Leukopetra, and the Topography of the Middle Haliakmon Valley," in P. Derow and R. Parker, eds., *Herodotus and his World* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 203–18.

¹⁵ Hammond, *State*, pp. 1–8.

was not fully integrated into adult society until he had killed a wild boar in the hunt and an enemy in combat.¹⁶

Nevertheless, on the rich alluvial lands of Pieria and Bottia, the Macedonians who devoted themselves to more sedentary occupations cultivated cereals, vegetables and all kinds of fruit trees. The Macedonian kings took particular pains to regulate the water courses, to undertake land-reclamation schemes and to provide diligent cultivators for the land.¹⁷

The Macedonian land was not merely a source of agricultural wealth. It concealed mineral treasures too: copper, iron, and in the eastern part, gold and silver in exceptional quantities. The working of the mines, which was exclusively a royal prerogative, and the exploitation of the forests, also in the hands of the state, constituted the two foundations of the material strength of the monarchy.¹⁸

The exploitation of the mines and forests was accompanied by the development of activities related to converting and marketing raw materials. Consequently, already from the earliest historical records in the fifth century BC, Macedonia displays the characteristics not only of a rural, but also of a partly urbanised society.¹⁹

From its very foundation the Argead kingdom appears as the state of a people (*ethnos*), the Argeadai Macedonians, but centred around a *polis*-capital, Aegae. Its subsequent expansion led to the inclusion within the kingdom of other settlements, which since the end of the sixth century were also qualified as *poleis* in our sources. As we shall see below, in the course of the following two centuries, some of them managed to secede from the kingdom either to join other political formations as autonomous units (the Athenian confederacy or the Chalcidic League) or in an attempt to attain independent status.²⁰

Central power was focused in the king and his immediate entourage. His freedom of action was however reined in by the obligation to govern according to customary law, the Macedonian *nomos*. This regulated his

¹⁶ For the rites of passage in ancient Macedonia, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Cultes et rites de passage en Macédoine*, (MEΛETHMATA) 19 (Athens, 1994).

¹⁷ See above, note 10.

¹⁸ E. N. Borza, "The Natural Resources of Early Macedonia," in W. L. Adams and E. N. Borza, eds., *Philip II, Alexander the Great and the Macedonian Heritage* (Washington D.C., 1982), pp. 1–20, republished in E. N. Borza, *Makedonika* (Claremont, 1995), pp. 37–55, Hammond, *State*, pp. 177–87; id., "Philip's Innovations in Macedonian Economy," *Symbolae Osloenses* 70 (1995) 22–9, reprinted in id., *Collected Studies*, 4 (Amsterdam, 1997), pp. 125–32.

¹⁹ Hammond, *State*, pp. 9–12.

²⁰ Cf. Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 1, pp. 464–86 (see above, note 1).

relations with the *ethnos* and with the other members of the dynasty and also with his Companions, those few dozens of Macedonians who formed his entourage and without whose support he would have been unable to rule effectively. The “commons” made only rare appearances during this period, notably as a last resort, punishing a king’s failure by dismissing him from the throne.

The predominant position of the king was due not only to the fact that he was the political, military and religious leader of the Argeadai Macedonians, who founded the kingdom of Aegae, but also that he united in his person two other capacities. He was suzerain, more or less recognized and obeyed, of the kings of Upper Macedonia, and at the same time the master of conquered cities and territories that had not yet been colonized by Macedonians and integrated into Macedonia proper.²¹

After the conquests and the annexations of Philip II, which tripled the territory of the kingdom, Macedonia proper was divided in four administrative and military regions (Upper Macedonia, Bottia, Amphaxitis, Parastrymonia(?)), each under a *strategos*, who supervised and controlled the political units (old *poleis* in the Old Kingdom), new boroughs (*metropoleis*) with their satellite villages (*komai*) in the New Territories, and old *ethnē* in Upper Macedonia, into which the country had been systematically subdivided by his reforms.²²

²¹ Cf. Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 1, pp. 487–96.

²² On the civic units of Macedonia, see Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 1, pp. 49–123, and on the administrative districts, id., *Institutions*, 1, pp. 230–60.

CHAPTER 3

MACEDONIANS AND OTHER GREEKS

M. B. Hatzopoulos

A couple of years before the collapse of the Soviet system ignited nationalist passions in the dormant backwaters of South-Eastern Europe an English historian writing in German, observed that “the question of the actual nationality of the ancient Macedonians . . . is scientifically trivial and has acquired importance in modern times only because nationalists of all sorts in the Balkans and elsewhere have laid hold of it, and each according to the answer, has put it in the service of territorial or other claims.” Moreover, he continued, “All ancient accusations that the Macedonians were not Greeks originate from Athens, from the time of the conflict with Philip II . . . Only because of the political conflict with Macedonia was the question at all raised.” He also stressed that “today it must be considered as certain that the Macedonians and their kings actually spoke a Greek dialect and bore names of Greek type.”¹ Paradoxically, six years earlier his former thesis supervisor, a reputed scholar, hailing from a German-speaking country but writing in English, delivered at an international symposium staged by the National Gallery of Art at Washington a paper with practically the same title as the present chapter, challenging the Greek credentials of the ancient Macedonians.² His communication claimed to concentrate not on what the Macedonians actually were, but exclusively on the way in which they were perceived by their contemporaries, discarding as irrelevant the objective criteria on which national identities are usually evaluated (ancestry, language, religion, customs), only to reserve for the *finale* the argument that the most important objective criterion, to wit language, proved that the Macedonians were not Greeks. Indeed according to him “Greek was a difficult, indeed a foreign, tongue”

¹ R. M. Errington, *Geschichte Makedoniens* (Munich, 1986), p. 13.

² E. Badian, “Greeks and Macedonians,” in Beryl Barr-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, eds., *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (Washington D.C., 1982), pp. 33–51.

to Macedonians, and a Greek, such as Eumenes, “could not directly communicate with Macedonian soldiers.”

How is it possible that such radically opposed opinions can be simultaneously aired by historians moving in the same scholarly circles and working on the same documents? Have the ensuing decades brought forth new evidence liable to decide the issue? Is it possible to keep clear of politics and polemics ancient and modern in order to reach a balanced conclusion? Such are some of the questions we shall address in the following pages.

To begin with we must admit that sometimes, perceptions can ignore “objective criteria” of national identity and that there are no such eternal essences as “Greeks” and “Macedonians.” Both terms cover in fact complex realities which never ceased to evolve, from the moment we begin to apprehend them down to our own days.³ Thus, even if we focus on the period between the Persian Wars, when Macedonia first comes to the fore, and the abolition of an even nominally independent Macedonian state in 148 BC, we realize that the concepts expressed by these terms did not remain stable. A further complication arises from the geographical discrepancy between these two ethnics and the corresponding toponyms: *Hellas*, variable in itself, is not necessarily co-terminal with the *Hellenes* and *Makedonia* is not necessarily co-terminal with the *Makedones*. Thus *Hellas* can mean in Demosthenes⁴ only continental Greece north of the Isthmus, or in Herodotus⁵ Greece from the Peloponnese to Epirus and Thessaly inclusively, or in Xenophon⁶ all lands inhabited by Greeks. As late as in the second century BC Philip V of Macedon could argue, “How do you define Greece? For most of the Aetolians themselves are not Greeks. No! The countries of the Agraei, the Apodotae, and the Amphilochians are not Greece,”⁷ in which he was consistent with Thucydides,⁸ who qualified the Aetolian tribe of the Eurytanes as “most unintelligible in tongue and eaters of raw flesh.” Conversely *Makedonia* could alternatively designate the Argead (and later the Antigonid) possessions irrespective of the origin

³ See in particular J. M. Hall, “Contested Ethnicities: Perceptions of Macedonia within Evolving Definitions of Greek Identity,” in I. Malkin, ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, Mass./London, 2001), pp. 159–186; id., *Hellenicity* (Chicago, 2002), pp. 154–156 and 165–166.

⁴ 19.303.

⁵ 8.44–47.

⁶ *Anab.* 6.5,23.

⁷ Polyb. 18.5.7–8.

⁸ 3.94.5.

of its inhabitants, or all the lands inhabited by the *Makedones*, irrespective of their being under the sway of the Argead kings or of other rulers.⁹

Although recent contributions have legitimately made us wary of the essentialist temptation, and have stressed the importance of discourse and perceptions, it would be nevertheless foolish to deny the existence of characteristics, such as language, cults, beliefs, and customs, which, though not immutable, evolve much slower than the perceptions related thereof and the discourse, both of which are amenable to a variety of exogenous influences.

Following the evolution of the fluctuating relations between realities, perceptions and discourse in the case of the Macedonians within the Greek world may prove a useful lead towards answering the questions that we need to address.

The Fifth Century BC

There is one illusion that ought to be first dispelled—that Mt Olympus and the Kambounian mountains constituted an impassable barrier between Thessaly and Macedonia. In fact recent archaeological discoveries have established that already in the second millennium BC the Mycenaean world extended well beyond Thessaly and included at least the southern part of Macedonia. Abundant Mycenaean pottery, both imported and locally produced, weapons, pins, brooches and syllabic script have been found in tombs of Orestis, Elimeia and Pieria.¹⁰

Bruno Helly¹¹ has recently argued that the kingdom of Philoctetes in the Homeric catalogue of ships extended in Pieria as far as the head of the Thermaic Gulf. The monumental pieces of all-round sculpture (*kouroi*, *korai*, funerary lions, *sphinges*, etc.),¹² the archaic ceramic heads from

⁹ Cf. Thuc. 2.99.2–6 and M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, 1 (MEΛETHMATA) 22 (Athens, 1996), pp. 204–209.

¹⁰ Georgia Karamitrou, *Boion-Notia Orestis* (Thessaloniki, 1999), 1, pp. 120–126; Effi Poulaki-Pandermali, “L’Olympe macédonien et ses premiers cimetières,” in Julia Vokotopoulou, ed., *La civilisation grecque* (Athens, 1993), pp. 122–127; B. Helly, “Le dialecte thessalien, un autre modèle de développement,” in I. Hajnal, ed., *Die altgriechischen Dialekte* (Innsbruck, 2007), p. 197.

¹¹ Helly, “Le dialecte thessalien,” pp. 198–200.

¹² Ch. Tsoungaris, “Ανασκαφικές έρευνες στο νεκροταφείο κλασσικών χρόνων του νέου ύδραγωγείου Πενταβρύσου Καστοριάς,” in *AErgMak* 18 (Thessaloniki, 2006), p. 687; Georgia Karamitrou-Mentesidi, “Aiane,” in R. Ginouvès and M. B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 29–32; ead., “Aianè, ville de Macédoine,” in Vokotopoulou, ed., *La civilisation grecque*, pp. 32–35.

Vergina,¹³ the massive production¹⁴ or import of metallic and ceramic¹⁵ drinking vessels,¹⁶ evident from the second quarter of the sixth century, discovered in inner Macedonia, from Aiane in Elimeia to Europos in the Axios valley,¹⁷ attest the vigorous exchanges between Macedonia and Greece south of the Olympus. It is not a coincidence that Apollo in the Homeric hymns haunts the pastures of Pieria¹⁸ or that the Hesiodic *Eoëae*¹⁹ couples together the eponymous heroes of the Macedonians and the Magnetes as sons of Zeus and Thyia, the sister of Hellen, and locates them “around Pieria and Olympus.” Already by the end of the sixth century Macedonians from Pieria made offerings to Apollo at Delphi.²⁰ The archaeological and epigraphic finds are confirmed and illustrated in Herodotus’ narrative²¹ of the Persian advance in Thessaly, which makes abundantly clear that in the late Archaic period the local populations moved freely from Thessaly to Macedonia and vice versa, using, besides the Tempe valley, other passes, such as the one through Gonnoi, and, undoubtedly, also those of Petra and Volustana.

By the beginning of the classical period, the archaeological evidence leaves no doubt about the integration of Macedonia in the contemporary Hellenic world. The earliest signs are to be found in the maritime urban centres such as Pydna, where in male tombs strigils are found, with evidence of a new athletic habit, which tends to replace the deposition of weapons.²² It is true that many Macedonian men, preserving an archaic tradition, continued to be buried with their weapons, but this custom, which had been discontinued in the Peloponnese, south-eastern conti-

¹³ M. Andronikos, “Tombs at Vergina,” in Ginouvès, Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia* pp. 35–39.

¹⁴ Julia Vokotopoulou, “Αργυρά και χάλκινα έργα τέχνης,” in *Ελληνική τέχνη* (Athens, 1997), p. 29; Eudokia Skarlatidou, “Αρχαϊκή χάλκινη ύδρια από τὸ νεκροταφείο τῆς Θέρμης (Σέδες) Θεσσαλονίκης,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 499–509.

¹⁵ Anastasia and P. Chrysostomou, “Τάφοι πολεμιστῶν τῶν ἀρχαϊκῶν χρόνων ἀπὸ τῆ δυτικῆ νεκρόπολη τοῦ Ἀρχοντικοῦ Πέλλας,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 113–132.

¹⁶ Beryl Barr-Sharrar, “Metalwork in Macedonia before and during the Reign of Philip II,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 485–498.

¹⁷ The best photograph of the monument before its mutilation is to be found in M. B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulou, eds., *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1981), p. 27.

¹⁸ *Hymn to Apollo* 216; *Hymn to Hermes* 191.

¹⁹ Fr 7, in R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, *Hesiodi fragmenta selecta* (Oxford, 1970).

²⁰ G. Rougemont, *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes*, 1 (Paris, 1977), no. 1; cf. Pausanias 10.13.5.

²¹ 7.73.

²² M. Besios, “Νεκροταφεία τοῦ 5^{ου} αἰ. π.Χ. στῆ Β. Πιερία,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), p. 647.

mental Greece, and the islands, had been maintained in Thessaly and in Epirus.²³ The ever increasing number of fifth-century figured funerary stelae from Orestis,²⁴ Dion,²⁵ Pydna,²⁶ and Aigai,²⁷ all indigenous Macedonian cities,²⁸ but also from more cosmopolitan Pella,²⁹ are works of sculpture which, though they show an unmistakable connection with Thessaly,³⁰ might have been found anywhere in the Greek world. This is equally true of the inscribed tombstones from the same localities. The fifth century funerary inscriptions from Upper Macedonia and from “the cradle of the Macedonian kingdom” commemorate men and women bearing exclusively Greek names such as Kleiona, Attya (Aiane),³¹ Leon, Mariskos, Theoteles, Pannaios, Sosias (Pydna),³² Xanthos, and Amadika (Pella).³³

If we now turn to what the fifth-century authors have to say about the Macedonians, we note that their statements correspond to the picture emerging from the archaeological and epigraphic evidence. Herodotus presents Alexander I claiming both a Macedonian and a Greek identity as perfectly compatible. He states that he is of Greek ancestry and could not suffer to see Greece enslaved instead of free, and concludes declaring

²³ A. and P. Chrysostomou, “Τάφοι,” p. 118, with references.

²⁴ Ch. Tsoungaris, “Ανασκαφικές έρευνες στον νομό Καστοριάς κατά τὸ 1999,” in *AERG Mak* 13 (Thessaloniki, 2001), p. 618 and p. 622, fig. 12.

²⁵ Hatzopoulos, Loukopoulou, *Philip*, p. 26, fig. 11 (see above, note 17).

²⁶ M. Besios and Maria Pappa, *Πύδνα* (Thessaloniki, 1995), pp. 43, 45 and 73.

²⁷ Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Τὰ ἐπιτάφια μνημεία ἀπὸ τῆ μεγάλης Τοῦμπα τῆς Βεργίνας* (Thessaloniki, 1984), pp. 19–27, no. 1.

²⁸ For the Macedonian character of Pydna, see Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 1, p. 106, note 3, and M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Cités en Macédoine,” in M. Reddé et al., eds., *La naissance de la ville dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, 2003) pp. 130 and 139, n. 45; cf. M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Bulletin Epigraphique* 2005, no. 315.

²⁹ Hatzopoulos, Loukopoulou, *Philip*, p. 115, fig. 65; I. M. Akamatis, “Ξάνθος Δημητρίου καὶ Ἀμαδίκας υἱός,” in *AMHTOS: Τιμητικός τόμος γιὰ τὸν καθηγητὴ Μανόλη Ἀνδρόνικο* (Thessaloniki, 1987), pp. 13–29; Maria Lilimbaki-Akamati, “Recent Discoveries at Pella,” in Maria Stamatopoulou and Marina Yeroulanou, eds., *Excavating Classical Culture* (Oxford, 2002) p. 88 and pl. 20B.

³⁰ Myrina Kalaitzi, *Figured Tombstones from Macedonia, Fifth–First Century B.C.*, 1, (Oxford, forthcoming), pp. 216 and 218.

³¹ M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Bulletin Epigraphique* (1994), no 385.

³² Vasiliki Misailidou-Despotidou, *Επιγραφές ἀρχαίας Μακεδονίας* (Thessaloniki, 1997), pp. 66–68, nos. 56, 57, 62; I. Xydopoulos, “Νέες ἐπιγραφές ἀπὸ τὴν Πύδνα τῆς Πιερίας,” *Hel-lenika* 50 (2000), 35–43; cf. M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Bulletin Epigraphique* (2001), no. 277. The name Pan(n)aios is attested in Athens in the fourth century BC and the personal name Mariskos, from *mariskos*, the Greek name of the *gladium mariscus*, became popular among gladiators and is twice attested in Beroia in the Roman period.

³³ See above, note 26.

“I am Alexander the Macedonian.”³⁴ Previously³⁵ he had seen no contradiction in proclaiming simultaneously his Greek and Macedonian connection: “a Greek, second in command over the Macedonians.”³⁶ This is possible because Herodotus believed, rightly or wrongly, both in the Heraclid ancestry of the ruling house of Macedonia (in my opinion wrongly) and in the Dorian origin of the Macedonians (rightly, if we understand thereby that the founders and the elite of the Macedonian kingdom spoke a north-western dialect, for which, see below). He relates in some detail how the first was established by Alexander I on the occasion of his participation in the Olympic games: “I so happen to know for sure myself and I shall prove in my subsequent writings that [the descendants of Perdicas] are Greek.”³⁷ Herodotus, true to his word, provided the relative details three books later.³⁸ Similarly, the historian from Halicarnassus finds no difficulty in suggesting, albeit indirectly, that in fact the Macedonians were more Greek than the Athenians,³⁹ because they belonged to the Dorian kin. Before descending into the Peloponnese these Dorians had roamed from Phthia to the region around Mt Olympus and Mt Ossa, and thence to the Pindus, whereas the Athenians were of Pelasgian ancestry. Thus, in Herodotus’ view, the relation of the Macedonians to their Argead rulers was similar to that of the Lacedaemonians to their Agiad and Eurypontid kings,⁴⁰ and in no way implied that the former were not Greek. In both cases a branch of the Dorian kin was ruled by Heraclid, that is to say putatively “Achaean,” sovereigns.

Thucydides concurred with Herodotus. For him, too, “Alexander, the father of Perdikkas and his ancestors [were] originally Temenids from Argos.”⁴¹ Judging from his writings, nothing in his extended experience in northern Greece seems to have contradicted this belief. On the contrary, in his description of Sitalces’ invasion in Macedonia he contrasts the Thracian hordes, carrying knives and swarming the country in view of plunder, to the Macedonian cavalry, equipped with corselets in the Greek manner, and fighting bravely until they were engulfed by the Thracian multitudes.⁴²

³⁴ 9.45.2–3.

³⁵ 5.20.4.

³⁶ Hdt. 5.20.4.

³⁷ Hdt. 5.22.1–4.

³⁸ 8.137–39.

³⁹ Hdt. 1.56–58.

⁴⁰ Cf. Hdt. 5.72.3.

⁴¹ Thuc. 2.99.3.

⁴² Thuc. 2.98.3–4 and 105.

One could hardly find a more emblematic opposition between Greek and barbarian.

Thucydides' description of the allied Macedonian and Spartan forces that invaded Lynceus in 424 tells the same story. The Athenian historian contrasts the Macedonian and Chalcidian cavalry and the hoplite infantry of Perdiccas and Brasidas recruited from the Peloponnese, the Chalcidian League, Acanthus and the "Greeks" dwelling in Macedonia,⁴³ to the throngs of their barbarian allies.⁴⁴ The same distinction between the Macedonians and "the throng of the barbarians" is repeated in the beginning of the next chapter.⁴⁵

It has been argued that Thucydides is merely following Herodotus, who in his turn had swallowed Alexander I's propaganda.⁴⁶ However, it is very doubtful that the Athenian historian, who had a first hand experience of northern Greece, would let himself be "indoctrinated," least of all by Herodotus. Moreover, the fact that the essential Greekness of the Macedonians is also upheld by yet another fifth-century historian shows that such a view was not limited to a literary coterie, but was the *communis opinio* in that period. In effect, Hellanicus⁴⁷ makes of Macedon, the eponymous hero of the Macedonians, a son of Aiolus and thus grand-son of Hellen, the eponymous hero of all Greeks. N. G. L. Hammond⁴⁸ has convincingly argued that the reason for this "Aiolic" paternity of Macedon is that Hellanicus, who spoke himself the Aiolic dialect of Lesbos, recognized its common traits with the Macedonian dialect (for which, see below).

Legendary lists of kings, genealogies and myths were not literary distractions but reflected or influenced political practice. Alexander I was able to overcome the objections of his rivals who strove to exclude him from the Olympic contests by invoking an Argive genealogy. By the second half of the fifth century the Argive connection had been well established not only in literary works such as Thucydides' *Histories*, but also in the practice of Greek city-states and local or Panhellenic sanctuaries. Thus

⁴³ These were probably provided by the "allied" or rather subject cities of the Argæad kings (cf. *IG* I³ 89, l. 40; Xen., *Hell.* 5.2.13).

⁴⁴ Thuc. 4.124.1.

⁴⁵ Thuc. 4.125.1.

⁴⁶ Cf. E. N. Borza, "Athenians, Macedonians, and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House," in Carol G. Thomas, ed., *Makedonika* (Claremont, 1995), pp. 113–123, originally published in *Hesperia Supplement* 19 (1982), 7–13; id., *In the Shadow of Olympus* (Princeton, 1990), pp. 98–113.

⁴⁷ F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, no. 4, F 74.

⁴⁸ N. G. L. Hammond, in N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, 2 (Oxford, 1979), pp. 47–48.

Alexander I was deemed worthy to be honoured with the title of *proxenos* and *eueregetes* by the Athenians⁴⁹ and could erect a golden statue at Delphi (and perhaps also in Olympia) from the rich booty won from the Persians,⁵⁰ while Perdiccas II most likely participated in the contests of the Argive Heraion and won an inscribed bronze tripod, which was unexpectedly discovered among the funerary deposits of Tomb II at Aegae/Vergina.⁵¹ The tradition was pursued and extended by later Macedonian kings, as we shall see below. But the kings were not the only Macedonians active in the Panhellenic sanctuaries. Contrary to the opinion generally held, this was not a royal privilege explained by their alleged Heraclid ancestry, but, as we have already seen, the continuation of a practice by Macedonian commoners which is epigraphically attested in Delphi from the end of the sixth century.⁵²

With the reign of king Archelaus (413–399) the insertion of Macedon into the Greek *oikoumene* sees a notable acceleration and expansion. Thucydides⁵³ credits him with the building of roads and fortifications and with the distribution of weapons, perhaps especially to hoplite infantry, the lack of which had so severely handicapped his father Perdiccas II. The newly built walls and the emergence of a “middle class,” which was a prerequisite for the formation of a hoplite infantry,⁵⁴ gave the urban centres of the kingdom a new sense of identity and corporate loyalty, to the point that they might seek to secure their independence, as Pydna effectively did.⁵⁵ Indeed in the wake of Archelaus’ reign we first encounter Macedonians identified by their city ethnic (Alorites, Pydnaios).⁵⁶

Writers and artists had for nearly a century been frequent visitors of the Macedonian court. Pindar had composed probably there⁵⁷ an *enkomion*⁵⁸ for king Alexander I. Perdiccas II entertained in his capital the dithyrambic poet Melanippides and the father of scientific medicine Hippocrates of Cos. But it is under Archelaus that a qualitative leap took place and

⁴⁹ Hdt. 8.136.1 and 143.3.

⁵⁰ Hdt. 8.121.2; [Dem.] 12.21; Solinus 9.13.

⁵¹ M. Andronikos, *Vergina: The Royal Tombs* (Athens, 1993), pp. 164–166.

⁵² See above, note 18.

⁵³ 2.100.2.

⁵⁴ W. S. Greenwalt, “The Development of a Middle Class in Macedonia,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 87–96.

⁵⁵ Diod. 13.49.1.

⁵⁶ Hatzopoulos, “Cités,” pp. 130–131 and 139, note 50. (see above, note 28).

⁵⁷ Solinus 9.14.

⁵⁸ C. M. Bowra, *Pindari carmina* (Oxford, 1935), fr. 106.

Macedonia became an active centre of Hellenic culture.⁵⁹ The famous painter Zeuxis decorated his palace;⁶⁰ the celebrated architect Callimachus probably worked and died at Aegae too;⁶¹ both the prominent epic poet Choerilus and the great poet and musician Timotheus chose to live at the court of Archelaus and to die in Macedonia (the latter decades later). Agathon, one of the most significant Attic tragic poets, left Athens in ca. 408 and moved to Macedonia, where he produced several tragedies, of which only fragments survive. But the most famous and the most honoured of Archelaus' guests was Euripides, who spent his final years at the king's court writing his masterpieces *Iphigeneia in Aulis*, *Bacchae* and the lost play *Archelaos*, the homonymous hero of which he made, instead of Perdiccas, the founder of the dynasty, obviously in honour of his host. These latter two plays were perhaps performed also at the athletic and musical festival that Archelaus founded at Dion in honour of Zeus Olympius and the Pierian Muses.⁶²

Archelaus was a panhellenic celebrity. Honoured in Athens as *proxenos* and *euergetes*,⁶³ but slandered by Plato⁶⁴ and allegedly despised by Socrates,⁶⁵ crowned for his victories in chariot races at Olympia and Delphi,⁶⁶ he was justly celebrated by Thucydides⁶⁷ as the king who had accomplished more for Macedonia than his eight predecessors taken together. Yet the man who, according to a tradition,⁶⁸ was such a lover of literature that he allegedly appointed Euripides as his chief adviser and mourned his death by shaving his hair,⁶⁹ is the first Macedonian to be called a barbarian by one of his contemporaries. Indeed the sophist

⁵⁹ N. G. L. Hammond, "Intellectual Life," in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Macedonia* (Athens, 1983), p. 88.

⁶⁰ Ailianos, *VH* 14.17.

⁶¹ Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, "Ναῶν Εὐστῆλων, a Fragmentary Inscription of the Classical Period from Vergina," in *Inscriptions of Macedonia* (Thessaloniki, 1996), pp. 100–122.

⁶² Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, p. 149. S. Scullion, "Euripides and Macedon, or the Silence of the *Frogs*," *CQ* 53 (2003), 389–398, has recently denied the historicity of Euripides' presence at the court of Archelaus. Whatever one may think of the various imaginative legends attached to that presence, I still believe that Aristotle, *Politics* 13ub30–34, is a more trustworthy witness than the silence of the *Frogs*.

⁶³ *IG* I³ 117.

⁶⁴ *Gorgias*, 471.

⁶⁵ Aelian, *VH* 8.9; 12.43.

⁶⁶ Solinus 9.16.

⁶⁷ 2.100.2.

⁶⁸ Solinus 9.16.

⁶⁹ Solinus 9.16.

Thrasymachus of Chalcedon in one of his speeches in defence of the Larisaeans, of which only one sentence survives, exclaims “Shall we be slaves to Archelaus, we, being Greeks, to a barbarian?”⁷⁰ How is this paradox to be explained?

To begin with, the formula is an adaptation of a verse from Euripides’ tragedy *Telephos*, which was destined to become a stock expression, as we see later in Pseudo-Callisthenes,⁷¹ where Alexander exhorts the Macedonians to take up arms “in order that we campaign against the barbarians and deliver ourselves from Persian bondage, so that we, being Greeks, be not slaves to barbarians!” Given its clearly conventional character, it can hardly be taken literally as ethnological or linguistic evidence.⁷² It is particularly telling that Thrasymachus’ sally belongs to a speech in favour of Thessalians, about whom Stratoniceus according to Hegesandros⁷³ was to wonder whether they are “more or less barbarian than the Boeotians.”

In fact, the explanation of the paradox is probably to be sought in the position achieved by Macedon in the reign of Archelaus. After the loss of Amphipolis and the Sicilian disaster, Athens was no more in a position to threaten Macedonia, the Chalcidian League was quiescent and Thessaly was divided between opposing cities and factions.⁷⁴ Archelaus could make the most of his neutrality in the Peloponnesian war, recover the easternmost provinces of his kingdom, deal effectively with the Upper Macedonian “kings” and, finally, responding to the appeal of the Larisaeian Aleuadai, to intervene in Thessaly against the tyrants of Pherae.⁷⁵ It was the very successes of the Macedonian king that made him the target of abuse by the defeated partisans of the tyrants. “Barbarian” was an insult as good as any other for a king on the northern marches of the Greek *oikoumene*.

The Fourth Century BC

E. Badian asserted that Greek culture in Macedonia regressed during the first half of the fourth century.⁷⁶ Archaeology, but also the literary sources,

⁷⁰ F 2 (Diels), E. Badian’s translation.

⁷¹ 1.25.

⁷² See. E. Kapetanopoulos, “Xennias μακεδονίζων τῆι φωνῆι,” *Ephemeris* 60 (1993), pp. 23–24.

⁷³ In Athenaios 8.850a.

⁷⁴ Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, pp. 137–138.

⁷⁵ Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, pp. 139–141.

⁷⁶ Badian, “Greeks”, p. 37 (see above, note 2).

tell a different story. Finds from all over Macedonia (of which the cemetery of Phoinikas, near Thessaloniki, provides a well-dated specimen)⁷⁷ show the diffusion of panhellenic social habits (*e.g.* the *symposion* as an element of both private and public festivities, athletic training and formal education),⁷⁸ the multiplication of top-quality monumental sculpture from the sanctuary of Eucleia at Aegae/Vergina,⁷⁹ the ever-increasing number of figured tombstones (from Pydna, Aegae, Beroia and Pella, such as those of Callicrates,⁸⁰ Antigonus⁸¹ or Amyntas)⁸² created locally and most probably by Macedonian artists, and a plethora of inscribed funerary stelae bearing scores of names, of which only one is foreign (Thracian),⁸³ and several original epigrams in impeccable Greek metres.⁸⁴ A certain preference for martial self-representation is the only possible indicator of their Macedonian origin, as opposed to corresponding monuments found in the south-Greek colonies of the north Aegean shores. None of these developments implies a regression of Greek culture.

It so happens that from this first half of the fourth century dates the most extensive document in the local Macedonian dialect. Its importance is such that it requires a more detailed discussion. It is a curse tablet written by or on behalf of an abandoned woman and aiming at impeding the marriage of Dionysophon, her faithless lover, with another woman named Thetima. The dialect, as it might have been expected given the geographical position and the history of Macedonia, is basically north-western Greek—especially in morphology—with ‘Thessalian’ phonetic traits in the pronunciation of some vowels (neutralisation of the opposition between /e/

⁷⁷ Maria Tsimbidou-Avloniti, “Από ένα νεκροταφείο προγενέστερο της Θεσσαλονίκης,” *Ancient Macedonia* 7 (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 675–696.

⁷⁸ Cf. the stelae of the two Antigonoi from Vergina: Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Μνημεία*, pp. 44–54 and 108–111, nos. 3 and 9 (see above, note 27), and the inscribed bronze *stlengis* (strigil) from the necropolis of Aiiane: Georgia Karamitrou-Mentesidi, *Aiani* (Athens, 1996), p. 42, no. 26.

⁷⁹ Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, “Βεργίνα 1990. Άνασκαφή στο ιερό της Εύκλειας,” in *AErgMak* 4 (Thessaloniki, 1993), pp. 21–34.

⁸⁰ Besios-Pappa, *Πύδνα*, p. 73.

⁸¹ Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Μνημεία*, pp. 45–54, no. 3.

⁸² Loukretia Gounaropoulou and M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Έπιγραφές Κάτω Μακεδονίας. Τεύχος Α Έπιγραφές Βεροίας* (Athens, 1988), no. 498.

⁸³ Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Μνημεία*, pp. 165–169, no. 22 (Amadokos). For the importance of personal names in recapturing the demographic and cultural history of Macedonia, see Argyro B. Tataki, *Ancient Beroea: Prosopography and Society* (ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ) 8 (Athens 1988) pp. 407–513; M. B. Hatzopoulos, “L’histoire par les noms’ in Macedonia,” in S. Hornblower and Elaine Matthews, eds., *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 99–117.

⁸⁴ Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Μνημεία*, p. 53, no. 3; p. 79, no. 6, ead., “Fragmentary Inscription,” 100–122, *SEG* 24 (1969) 541; *SEG* 27 (1977) 298 and 1291.

and /i/ and between /o/ and /u/), and with the typically Macedonian substitution of voiced instead of unvoiced stops.⁸⁵ Thus, this document amply confirms the testimonies of Strabo⁸⁶ and Plutarch⁸⁷ on the affinity between the dialects spoken in Macedonia and in Epirus and also the existence of a distinctive Macedonian ‘accent’.⁸⁸ What this text, and two or three other shorter texts, clearly belie is E. Badian’s and A. B. Bosworth’s assertions that Macedonian was a “difficult,” “foreign,” “separate,” “alien,” and incomprehensible tongue to “Greeks.”⁸⁹ A speaker of Attic Greek would not have any greater difficulty in understanding a speaker of that dialect than, for instance, a Lacedaemonian or an Elaeian.

The literary texts tell the same story. Queen Eurydice, Amyntas III’s wife, dedicated a monument to the Muses explaining in a metrical epigram how she had taught herself reading and writing,⁹⁰ and her son, Perdiccas III, invited Plato’s pupil Euphraeus of Oreos in Macedonia, who gained a decisive influence on the life of the royal court, to the point that conversations at meals were allegedly restricted to geometry and philosophy.⁹¹ In spite of G. T. Griffith’s⁹² disbelief, Platonic influence at the Macedonian court did not necessarily disappear with the accession of Philip, as the eminently Platonic constitution that this king gave to the city of Philippi, his model foundation, can be argued to imply.⁹³ At the same time the ambitious policy of Alexander II in Thessaly was matched by the growth of the army, and especially the infantry, as can be inferred from the very extent of Macedonian losses in Perdiccas III’s war against the Illyrians. They show the continuing development of a ‘middle class’ in the cities of Macedonia.⁹⁴

⁸⁵ M. B. Hatzopoulos, *La Macédoine: géographie historique, langue, cultes et croyances, institutions* (Paris, 2006), pp. 47–48.

⁸⁶ 7.7.8.

⁸⁷ *Pyrrhos* 11.4; cf. 2.5–6.

⁸⁸ Pausanias 4.29.3.

⁸⁹ Badian, “Greeks” 41; A. B. Bosworth, “Eumenes, Neoptolemus, and PSI XII 1284,” *GRBS* 19 (1978), p. 236.

⁹⁰ For a recent discussion of that epigram, see Sylvie Le Bohec-Bouhet, “Réflexions sur la place de la femme dans la Macédoine antique,” in Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, M. B. Hatzopoulos, and Yvette Morizot, eds., *Rois, cités, nécropoles: institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine*, (MEΛETHMATA) 45 (Athens, 2006), p. 191.

⁹¹ Athenaeus, 11.508e.

⁹² Griffith in Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, p. 206, followed by Badian, “Greeks,” pp. 37–38.

⁹³ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 1, pp. 158–160 (see above, note 9).

⁹⁴ Greenwalt, “Middle Class,” pp. 92–94 (see above, note 54).

What is even more important than stories about Macedonian kings in literary works, as far as perceptions are concerned, is the actual practice of Greek states towards Macedonians. Fortunately, in this field we possess two very significant pieces of evidence. The first is a passage of Aeschines,⁹⁵ from which we learn that Amyntas III had participated via a delegate in the Panhellenic congress held in Sparta in 371. E. Badian's desperate efforts⁹⁶ to minimize its significance as evidence of the acceptance of the Greek character of the Macedonian state are ineffective, for it is confirmed by the second piece of evidence, which shows that the Macedonian state was treated by Panhellenic sanctuaries as any other Greek state. The 360 BC catalogue of the *thearodokoi*, that is to say the official hosts of the sacred envoys, of Asclepius from Epidaurus includes an entry "Macedonia: Perdiccas," which is the exact correspondent of "Molossoi: Tharyps."⁹⁷ In both cases the duties of *thearodokos* are assumed by the head of the state, who customarily extended his hospitality and protection to foreign envoys. In a similar manner, a few decades later, Cleopatra, acting as regent for her absent husband Alexander of Molossia, was the *theorodokos* of the sacred envoys from Argos.⁹⁸ In any of these instances it would be vain to pretend—a misconception that as yet, has not altogether disappeared—that this evidence concerns only the person of the head of the state and not the whole community. The mission of the *theoroi* was precisely to announce the holy truce and to invite to the relevant festival delegations from the population at large of the state to which they were despatched.

A similar misunderstanding has obfuscated the significance of the transfer of the two Phocian votes in the Amphictyonic Council in 346. At the conclusion of the Third Sacred War these votes were given, according to Diodorus,⁹⁹ to Philip II and his descendants, but according to Pausanias,¹⁰⁰ and to Demosthenes,¹⁰¹ to the Macedonians. As François Lefèvre has recently shown,¹⁰² there is no contradiction between these testimonies, because Philip and the subsequent kings of Macedon are mentioned

⁹⁵ 2.32. The importance of this event has been recently vindicated by M. Zahrt, "Amyntas III. und die griechischen Mächte," *Ancient Macedonia* 7 (Thessaloniki, 2007), p. 245.

⁹⁶ Badian, "Greeks," p. 47, n. 33.

⁹⁷ *JG* V 1, 94.

⁹⁸ P. Charneau, "Liste argienne de théarodokes," *BCH* 90 (1966), p. 157, col. I, L. 11.

⁹⁹ 16.60.1.

¹⁰⁰ 10.3.3 and 10.8.2.

¹⁰¹ 19.327.

¹⁰² F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions* (Athens/Paris, 1998), pp. 94–101.

specifically in their capacity as heads of state and official representatives of the Macedonian *ethnos*, which is congruent with the very principle of the exclusively “ethnic” composition of the Amphictyony.

With the accession of Philip II in 360 we reach a new watershed for both the effective integration of Macedonia in the Hellenic community and of the opposition with which such integration was met, at least from some prominent Greek quarters.

The meteoric growth of Macedonia’s power and wealth under Philip II, Alexander III, and their immediate successors was known from literary sources,¹⁰³ but it is only very recently that we have begun to visualize it thanks to the abundant new archaeological evidence. It is enough to mention the palaces of Pella and Vergina,¹⁰⁴ “Macedonian” tombs of “Eurydice”¹⁰⁵ and tombs I and II of the Great Tumulus of Vergina,¹⁰⁶ but also dozens of other early vaulted and cist tombs, decorated or not, from all over Macedonia, from Eordaea to Amphipolis, and beyond. The paintings of some of them, such as the Rape of Persephone,¹⁰⁷ the Hunt¹⁰⁸ (Aegae/Vergina) or the twin guards¹⁰⁹ (Heracleia/Agios Athanasios) outclass anything that we have previously known from Greece in antiquity.¹¹⁰ The mosaic floors from Pella and Aegae remain unsurpassed anywhere in the fourth century.¹¹¹ From the historical point of view, the scores of sculptured or painted stelae are no less significant,¹¹² because they show that the appreciation of fine arts was not restricted to a courtly elite but was diffused to a much wider section of the population. In some fields, such as metalwork

¹⁰³ Cf. the *prooimion* of the 16th book of Diodorus 1.1–6.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. R. Ginouvès, “The Palaces,” in Ginouvès, Hatzopoulos, *Macedonia*, pp. 84–90.

¹⁰⁵ Angeliki Kottaridou, “Couleur et sens : l’emploi de la couleur dans la tombe de la reine Eurydice,” in Guimier-Sorbets, Hatzopoulos, Morizot, *Rois, cités, nécropoles*, pp. 155–166.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Andronikos, *Vergina* pp. 86–197 (see above, note 51).

¹⁰⁷ M. Andronikos, *Βεργίνα II. Ὁ τάφος τῆς Περσεφόνης* (Athens, 1994).

¹⁰⁸ Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Βεργίνα. Ὁ τάφος τοῦ Φιλίππου. Ἡ τοιχογραφία μὲ τὸ κυνήγι* (Athens, 2004).

¹⁰⁹ Maria Tsimbidou-Avloniti, *Μακεδονικοὶ τάφοι στὸν Φοῖνικα καὶ στὸν Ἅγιο Ἀθανάσιο Θεσσαλονίκης* (Athens, 2005).

¹¹⁰ See now the admirable work of Hariclia Brecoulaki, *La peinture funéraire de Macédoine: Emplois et fonctions de la couleur, IV^e–II^e s. av. J.C.*, (MEΛETHMATATA) 48 (Athens, 2006) and the collective volume Sophie Descamps-Lequime, ed., *Peinture et couleur dans le monde grec antique* (Paris – Milan, 2007), with contributions on Macedonia by Katerina Rhimiopoulou, Angeliki Kottaridi, Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, Maria Tsimbidou-Avloniti, Agnès Rouvret, Hariclia Brecoulaki, Penelope Malama, and Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets.

¹¹¹ Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, “Mosaic,” in Ginouvès, Hatzopoulos, *Macedonia*, pp. 117–136.

¹¹² See Myrina Kalaitzi, *Figured Tombstones* (forthcoming).

and miniature sculpture, readily admired by any visitor of the Museum of Vergina or Thessaloniki, Macedonia appears not only to have assimilated the artistic lessons of the greater city-states, but to have become herself a leading centre of Greek art.¹¹³

The picture of Macedonia in the second half of the fourth century would be incomplete without even a passing mention of its intellectual life. Philip himself, in spite of what Demosthenes claims,¹¹⁴ was a man with a taste for literature and philosophy,¹¹⁵ Alexander the Great was an amateur of painting and sculpture, a passionate reader of epic and tragic poetry, and had an insatiable and encyclopaedic curiosity in the human physical sciences.¹¹⁶ Cassander was an appreciated patron both of philosophers and of artists.¹¹⁷ It would be tedious to enumerate all the intellectuals and artists active in Macedonia during these years. It should be enough to mention some celebrities, such as the philosophers Speusippus, Aristotle and Theophrastus, the historians Theopompus and Callisthenes, the painters Nicomachus and Philoxenos, the sculptor Lysippus, and a host of lesser poets, actors and all sorts of scholars and artists, such as the ones who followed Alexander's expedition to the East. What is even more interesting is that the Macedonians are no longer only "consumers" but also producers of Greek culture. Antipater wrote a history of the Illyrian wars of Perdiccas III.¹¹⁸ Marsyas of Pella, half-brother of Antigonus Monophthalmus, composed a history of his country,¹¹⁹ and half a dozen of Alexander's companions from Upper Macedonia, the "Old Kingdom," and Philip's enlarged

¹¹³ See the seminal article by Beryl Bar-Sharrar, "Macedonian Metal Vases in Perspective: Some Observations on Context and Tradition," in Beryl Bar-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, eds., *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times* (Washington D.C., 1982), pp. 123–139; ead., "Metalwork in Macedonia before and during the Reign of Philip II," in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 485–498. See also in D. Pandermalis, ed., *Alexander the Great* (Athens, 2004) the lavishly illustrated contributions of Angeliki Kottaridi, "The Symposium," pp. 65–87 and Eleni Trakosopoulou, "Jewelry in Macedonia," pp. 115–137.

¹¹⁴ Demosthenes, 19.308, Aeschines called him "most Greek among men."

¹¹⁵ For artistic and intellectual life at Philip's court, see J. R. Ellis, "Macedonia under Philip," in Hatzopoulos, Loukopoulou, *Philip*, pp. 146–165.

¹¹⁶ H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosographischer Grundlage*, 1 (Munich, 1926), pp. 65–80. For a recent bibliography of Alexander's scientific endeavours, see H. U. Wiemer, *Alexander der Grosse* (Munich, 2005), p. 323.

¹¹⁷ For a recent evaluation, see Franca Landucci Gattinoni, *L'arte del potere. Vita e opere di Cassandro di Macedonia*, (Historia Einzelschriften) 171 (Stuttgart, 2003), pp. 137–144.

¹¹⁸ Jacoby, *FGrHist*, no. 114.

¹¹⁹ Jacoby, *FGrHist*, no. 135.

Macedonia—the most eminent of whom was Ptolemy—wrote their versions of the great Asiatic adventure.¹²⁰

As far as political praxis is concerned, Philip, already from 356, long before he dominated peninsular Greece, took part in the Olympic contests and was crowned twice as an Olympic victor (356 and 352).¹²¹ In 352 he became the elected head of state of the Thessalian League.¹²² Six years later not only did Macedonia become a member of the Amphictyonic Council, but Philip himself presided at the Panhellenic Pythian festival of that year.¹²³ Ten years later Philip died as the *hegemon* of the Hellenic League and commander in chief of the Hellenic war of revenge against the Persian empire.¹²⁴

This was also the time when the cities of Macedonia acquired not only their physically “Greek” aspect, with the building of columnated temples (Aegae/Vergina),¹²⁵ theatres (Dion¹²⁶ Aegae/Vergina¹²⁷), and gymnasia (Amphipolis),¹²⁸ but also their political autonomy and the relevant civic institutions. They deal directly with the Panhellenic sanctuaries, as the Nemean list of *theorodokoi*,¹²⁹ and the presence of their citizens increasingly identified by their city ethnic,¹³⁰ reveal. They formed their own civic laws (Dion)¹³¹ and were administered by their own magistrates, councils and assemblies.¹³² The central government itself acquired a more professional character with the creation of a “Secretariat,” which used, instead

¹²⁰ Jacoby, *FGrHist*, nos. 122 (Amyntas); 124 (Kallisthenes); 133 (Nearchos); 135 (Marsyas); 138 (Ptolemy); 139 (Aristobulus).

¹²¹ Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, pp. 664–665; M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Actes de vente d'Amphipolis*, (MEΛETHMATA) 14 (Athens, 1991), pp. 82–83.

¹²² Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, pp. 285–295.

¹²³ Hammond, Griffith, *Macedonia*, 2, pp. 450–456, with Lefèvre, *Amphictionie*, p. 94.

¹²⁴ M. B. Sakellariou, “Panhellenism: From Concept to Policy,” in Hatzopoulos, Loukopolou, *Philip*, pp. 142–145.

¹²⁵ Stella Drougou and Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Βεργίνα: ό τόπος και ή ιστορία του* (Athens, 2006), pp. 134–138.

¹²⁶ D. Pandermalis, *Δίον* (Athens, 1999), pp. 75–79.

¹²⁷ Drougou and Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Βεργίνα*, pp. 126–133.

¹²⁸ Kalliopi D. Lazaridi, “Τό γυμνάσιο τής Αμφίπολης,” in *Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη* (Thessaloniki, 1990), pp. 241–273.

¹²⁹ S. G. Miller, “The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games,” *Hesperia* 57 (1988), 147–163.

¹³⁰ Manuela Mari, *Al di là dell'Olimpo*, (MEΛETHMATA) 34 (Athens, 2002), pp. 289–332; I. K. Xydopoulos, *Κοινωνικές και πολιτιστικές σχέσεις τών Μακεδόνων και τών άλλων Έλλήνων*, 2nd ed. (Thessaloniki, 2006), pp. 98–114.

¹³¹ Hatzopoulos, *Institutions*, 2, p. 73, no. 56. Cf. a partial photograph of the stone in D. Pandermalis, *Δίον. Αρχαιολογικός χώρος και Μουσείο* (Athens, 1997), p. 9.

¹³² Hatzopoulos, “Cités,” pp. 133–137.

of the local dialect, the Attic *koine*, which was then becoming the *lingua franca* of the whole Aegean basin.¹³³

Paradoxically, however, this is also the time when the identification of the Macedonians as barbarians and their rejection from the Greek community becomes most virulent.

Demosthenes does not miss an occasion to call Philip¹³⁴ as well as the Macedonians¹³⁵ barbarians, and to heap on them every sort of abuse. But, as E. Badian¹³⁶ has rightly stressed, the very virulence of his attacks disqualifies them as historical evidence. Much more intriguing are the distinctions made between Macedonians and Greeks and between the kings and the Macedonian commoners by Isocrates in three passages of his essay on Philip. In the first¹³⁷ he writes that the founder of the Macedonian monarchy “left altogether the land of Greece and desired to acquire a kingdom in Macedonia.” In the second¹³⁸ it is asserted (inaccurately) that “he was the only Greek who thought fit to rule over a people of a different stock, and was thus also the only one who was able to escape the perils inherent to monarchies.” In the third one¹³⁹ Isocrates advises Philip that he “ought to become the benefactor of the Greeks, to reign over the Macedonians and to rule over as many barbarians as possible.” “If you act in this way,” pursues Isocrates, “all will be grateful to you, the Greeks for your benefactions, the Macedonians because you govern them in a royal but not tyrannical manner, and the other nations, if they get rid of a barbaric and despotic rule and benefit from a Greek superintendence.” These passages have been extensively discussed, because Isocrates, contrary to Demosthenes and to other Athenian orators of that period (Deinarchus, Lycurgus, Hyperides), was most favourably disposed to Philip and had no possible reason to slight the Macedonians. The partisans of the non Hellenic character of the Macedonians have found in them the irrefutable confirmation of their thesis.¹⁴⁰ The champions of Macedonian

¹³³ M. B. Hatzopoulos, “The Language: The Origins of the *Koine*,” in Ginouvès, Hatzopoulos, *Macedonia*, pp. 79–80; cf. Cl. Brixhe and Anna Panayotou, “L’atticisation de la Macédoine: l’une des sources de la *koiné*,” *Verbum* 11 (1988), pp. 245–260.

¹³⁴ 3.17; 3.24; 19.305; 19.308; 9.31; cf. 18.185.

¹³⁵ Dem., 19.327.

¹³⁶ Badian, “Greeks,” p. 42.

¹³⁷ Isocrates, *Philip*, 107.

¹³⁸ Isocrates, *Philip*, 108.

¹³⁹ Isocrates, *Philip*, 154.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Badian, “Greeks,” pp. 42 and 50, n. 69.

Hellenism have cavilled over the significance of individual terms used by the orator.¹⁴¹

It is indeed true that, as we have seen, Greece (Hellas), like Europe today, has a rather elastic meaning, which varies both according to historical periods and within the same period according to the authors who use it. Macedonians might be Greeks, even if they lived outside the lands traditionally called Hellas. It is also true that ‘people of a different stock’ (*ouch homophylou genous*), just like similar expressions (*allophylos*), might also be used for Greeks of a different origin. But—especially in view of the third passage—it is undeniable that, taken as a whole, Isocrates’ essay clearly distinguishes between Greeks and Macedonians. The pertinent question is why the Athenian orator insisted on that distinction at a moment when in political praxis the Macedonians were perceived and treated like Greeks by other Greek states and by Panhellenic sanctuaries and organisations.

Isocrates’ essay was written soon after the Peace of Philocrates between Athens and Macedon and their respective allies, which put an end to the Third Sacred War in 346. Its nominal addressee was Philip, but in fact it was equally aimed at Greek—and more particularly Athenian—public opinion. Isocrates was pursuing with Philip his old project of uniting the Greeks, in order to crush the Persian might, thereby putting an end to Achaemenid meddling in Greek affairs, and securing territories which could be used for the settlement of landless and homeless Greeks. Philip was the last in a long list of prospective champions, which included Dionysius tyrant of Syracuse, Agesilaus and Archidamus kings of Sparta, and Jason and his son Alexander, tyrants of Pherai.¹⁴² The problem was that many Greeks and most of all the Athenians were extremely wary of monarchs, be they kings or tyrants.¹⁴³ By 346 Isocrates had understood that his exhortations could not have a wide appeal unless he could mitigate the mistrust that was roused by the name “king” or “tyrant.” With Philip, he thought that he had found a champion with a characteristic which he could exploit for this purpose and decided to make the most of it. Although the kings of Macedon were Greeks, when they decided to conquer and rule a kingdom, alone among the Greeks they sought one which lay outside Greece, because they were—and still were—too respectful of

¹⁴¹ Cf. A. B. Daskalakis, *Ἄ Ἑλληνισμός τῆς ἀρχαίας Μακεδονίας* (Athens, 1960), pp. 413–425.

¹⁴² Sakellariou, “Panhellenism,” pp. 128–134 (see above, note 124).

¹⁴³ For what follows, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, “Perception of the Self and the Other: The Case of Macedonia,” in *Ancient Macedonia 7* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 63–65.

Greek democratic liberties to try to impose a monarchical regime on their compatriots. Thus, Isocrates implies, the Greeks could trust Philip and not fear that they may be subjected to his autocratic rule.

Some Macedonians might not have appreciated being relegated to this category of neither Greek nor barbarian, but that was not the Athenian orator's first concern. On the other hand Philip, to whom he appealed, would be only too happy to see his Heraclid pedigree confirmed. Just like the kings of Sparta or of Molossia, he was set apart by it from his subjects, who were thus indirectly cautioned not to aspire to Greek democratic liberties. As I have written elsewhere,¹⁴⁴ it is not impossible that Philip shared Isocrates' concern to keep his kingdom separate from the other states of the projected alliance. Certainly, as if heeding Isocrates' advice, he preferred not to include it in the Hellenic League which was finally constituted in 337.

The decision to exclude the Macedonians from the Hellenic League proved a mistake with long-term consequences, for it enabled the anti-Macedonian politicians of the later fourth and the third century to construct a "Hellenic" identity from which the Macedonians were excluded. Thus Hypereides¹⁴⁵ could pretend that the Lamian War was fought for the freedom of all the Greeks and was comparable to Panhellenic ventures such as the Trojan or the Persian wars,¹⁴⁶ and the Attic decree in honour of Euphron of Sicyon of 318/7¹⁴⁷ speaks of "the Hellenic war that the people of Athens started on behalf of the Greeks." This theme finds one of its last echoes as late as 268/7 in the decree of Chremonides,¹⁴⁸ in which Athenians and Peloponnesians are represented as united and ready to fight for the liberty of Greece, as they had done during the Persian wars, implicitly equating thereby Antigonos Gonatas to Xerxes. The fact that the alliance of the *Macedonian* king Ptolemy II, the Athenians, the Spartans, and a dozen other cities of the Peloponnese bore no resemblance by any stretch of imagination to the Hellenic alliance of 480¹⁴⁹ did not trouble the enthusiastic author of the decree. In that he was no more inconsistent than a politician such as Hypereides,¹⁵⁰ who in one and the same paragraph

¹⁴⁴ Hatzopoulos, "Perception," p. 65.

¹⁴⁵ *Epitaph*. 12; 24; 34–35–38.

¹⁴⁶ Xydopoulos, *Σχέσεις*, pp. 83–84.

¹⁴⁷ *IG* II² 448, L. 43–45.

¹⁴⁸ *IG* II² 687.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Chr. Habicht, *Athènes hellénistique* (Paris, 2000), p. 162.

¹⁵⁰ *Epitaph*, 11.

could equate Athens and her allies in the Lamian war with those who had fought in the Persian wars for the freedom of all the Greeks, and name as their enemies “the Boeotians, the Macedonians and the Euboeans.”

At the root of such contradictions was the ambiguous meaning of the term “Hellenes,” which these orators were using (and abusing). Besides its common meaning of persons speaking a Greek dialect, practicing Greek cults, and living according to Greek customs, this term acquired in 337 the technical meaning of “members of the Hellenic League,” the so called League of Corinth, of which the Macedonian state (viz. the king) was the leader (*hegemon*), though he was not himself a part of it. This ambiguity has bedevilled writers from Arrian, who vainly tried to accommodate it in his speeches,¹⁵¹ to E. N. Borza, who failed to recognize it.¹⁵²

E. Badian¹⁵³ rightly points out that nearly all references to antagonism or even difference between Greeks and Macedonians are in speeches composed by Arrian himself. In these he has taken great pains to convey the content of such distinction. It is obvious in the alleged speech of Callisthenes¹⁵⁴ in which “Greeks” and “Macedonians,” after being distinguished from each other, are lumped together as destined to honour Alexander in “a human and Greek style,” in contrast to Persians and other “barbarians.”

More interesting than Arrian’s freely rhetorical compositions are descriptions of events which show actual political, administrative, or religious practice. One such circumstance, which has escaped the attention of both E. Badian and P. A. Brunt (who is E. Badian’s source in this matter), is the ceremony at Opis. There Arrian¹⁵⁵ describes how Alexander made sacrifices and gave a feast sitting in the midst of “Macedonians,” while next to them sat the Persians and other nations. The ceremony was initiated by “Greek seers” and “Magians.” There is a striking disequilibrium in this arrangement, for if the “Magians,” the Persians’ clergy, naturally officiated on behalf of the Persians and other Iranians, one may wonder why on the Macedonian side the religious specialists are described not as “Macedonian” but as “Greek.” The reason is obviously not that mantic art was practiced exclusively south of Mt Olympus, but that in the field of religion the distinction between “Macedonian” and “Greek” made no

¹⁵¹ Cf. Badian, “Greeks,” p. 51, n. 72.

¹⁵² See below.

¹⁵³ Badian, “Greeks,” p. 51, n. 72.

¹⁵⁴ Arr., *Anab.*, 2.4.8.

¹⁵⁵ Arr., *Anab.*, 7.11.8.

sense. There was no distinct Macedonian mantic art any more than there was a distinct Macedonian language. What did exist was the *political* distinction between the Macedonian kingdom and the Hellenic League, as another passage from Arrian makes abundantly clear.

E. N. Borza¹⁵⁶ thought that he had struck pure gold when he noticed that in Arrian's *Indica*,¹⁵⁷ almost certainly reproducing a list from Nearchus'—a Companion of Alexander's—work on the Indian Ocean, Alexander's trierarchs "are named according to their ethnicity." He further specified that he used the latter term "to describe a cultural identity that is near the meaning of nationality, but without the necessity of membership in a political organism" and he added that the relevant criteria of ethnicity are "language, contemporary perceptions, historical perceptions, and cultural institutions." The "ethnicities" of Alexander's trierarchs according to him were "Macedonian," "Greek," and "Persian."

A more attentive reading of the text in question, however, reveals that Arrian distinguishes not three but four categories of trierarchs: Macedonians, Greeks, Cypriots and one Persian, which requires a reconsideration of Borza's interpretation of the passage.

As I have repeatedly stressed,¹⁵⁸ the understanding of the Macedonian paradox, that is to say of a human group speaking a Greek dialect, celebrating Greek cults, and governed by Greek, albeit monarchic, institutions, and nevertheless occasionally distinguished from, and indeed opposed to the Greeks, cannot be understood in isolation. Its case must be studied in connection with that of other peripheral Greek-speaking peoples, such as the Epirotes and the Cypriotes. The former spoke a north-western Greek dialect, celebrated Greek cults taking part in the same Panhellenic events as other Greeks, and had Greek institutions, albeit of the *ethnos* and not of the *polis* variety. Yet from the time of Thucydides to that of Strabo the Epirotes were excluded from the geographical definition of Hellas and occasionally identified as barbarians. It was the absence down to the Hellenistic period of urban centres deserving the name and status of *polis* and the survival of ancestral kingship which explains the occasional and

¹⁵⁶ E. N. Borza, "Greeks and Macedonians in the Age of Alexander: The Source Traditions," in R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris, eds., *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian* (Norman/London, 1996), p. 125.

¹⁵⁷ 18.3–10.

¹⁵⁸ M. B. Hatzopoulos, "Prefazione," in Manuela Mari, *Olimpo*, pp. 9–10; id., "Perception," p. 60.

paradoxical denial of their Hellenism, especially when there was some political axe to grind.¹⁵⁹

The city-kingdoms of Cyprus, with the exception of Phoenician Kition and “autochthonous” Amathous, spoke a Greek dialect of Mycenaean origin and related to Arcadian, albeit written in an archaic syllabic script until well into the fourth century. Their cults were Greek, although Aphrodite, the principal goddess of the island, was of oriental origin.¹⁶⁰ But, after all, had she not been adopted by all the Greeks? The Cypriote kingships, like those of Macedonia and Epirus, were an anomaly for the majority of the polis-state minded Greeks of the classical period. But monarchies had survived elsewhere on the periphery of the Greek world, as in Cyrenaica, or had reappeared, as in Sicily. Thus no single criterion can satisfactorily explain the exclusion of the Cypriotes from the Greek community in the list of Alexander the Great’s trierarchs.

It is obvious that the “ethnic” criterion cannot adequately explain the arrangement of the list of Alexander’s trierarchs, especially since at the very same period, in the late twenties or the early tens of the fourth century, the contemporary catalogue of the *theorodokoi* from Nemea attests that both the Macedonians and the Cypriotes participated fully along with the other Greeks in Panhellenic sacrifices and contests.¹⁶¹ In fact, another anomaly ought to have made us suspicious of the alleged ethnicity distinction. The list of the Macedonian trierarchs comprises two persons of impeccable Greek ethnicity: Nearchus son of Androtimus from Lato in Crete, and Laomedon son of Larichus from Mytilene in Lesbos. In fact, just as the “forgotten” Cypriote category contradicts the allegedly binary opposition between “Greeks” on the one hand and ‘Macedonians’ on the other, an anomaly like the above belies the “ethnic” character of the list and can only be explained if the distinction reflects “nationality,” that is to say “Staatsangehörigkeit,” rather than ethnicity. In fact both Nearchus and Laomedon, when they moved to Macedonia, did not simply settle in the country, as did for instance Eumenes, who paid a heavy price for that mistake. They became citizens of Amphipolis and *ipso facto* also of the Macedonian Commonwealth. Ernst Badian¹⁶² ridicules the suggestion that the Macedonian state may have been “provided with a Department

¹⁵⁹ On the problem of the Epirotes, see M. B. Hatzopoulos, “The Boundaries of Hellenism in Epirus during Antiquity,” in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Epirus* (Athens, 1997), pp. 140–145.

¹⁶⁰ On the question of the Cypriote Greeks, see Hatzopoulos, “Perception,” pp. 60–63.

¹⁶¹ See above, note 125.

¹⁶² Badian, “Greeks,” p. 49, n. 50.

of Immigration and Naturalization,” or its citizens with “identity cards,” but, *pace* Badian, recent epigraphic finds have revealed that its cities were indeed provided with lists of their citizens.¹⁶³ It is therefore clear that the classification of the trierarchs is not based on ethnicity but on political criteria. All citizens of Macedonian civic units are classified as “Macedonians,” whatever their origin. Those who are classified as “Greeks” in Arrian’s list hail from Larissa in Thessaly, Cardia, Cos, Magnesia and Teos, all members of the Hellenic League, the first two since 337 and the remaining three since 332.¹⁶⁴ The kingdoms of Cyprus, on the other hand, which joined Alexander at the siege of Tyros, never joined the League whose members were officially styled “the Hellenes.”

In conclusion, as M. B. Sakellariou¹⁶⁵ has judiciously stressed, the contrast and occasionally the antagonism between Greeks and Macedonians was political and had to a certain extent social causes. The Macedonians satisfied indeed the “objective” criteria of Greekness enumerated by Herodotus.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, the eagerness with which they adopted the artistic and intellectual lessons of “the school of Hellas” should leave no doubt that, as Myrina Kalaitzi so aptly writes, they projected themselves as “the chief representatives of what was defined as Greek culture both at home and in their conquering campaigns to the East.”¹⁶⁷ Nevertheless, it is equally true that their Hellenic quality was repeatedly disputed, especially when political animosities created a suitable political environment. In the political field there was a double opposition between a majority of *polis* states and an *ethnos* state, as well as between regimes which ideally were democratic and a reputedly tyrannical monarchy. Thus, even for pro-Macedonians, such as Isocrates, wanting to dispel fears that the Macedonian kings might extend their monarchical regime to the Greek cities, it was important to dissociate as much as possible the Macedonian kingdom from the Greek *polis* states.

It should not come as a surprise that the subtleties of the Macedonian paradox were best understood by German scholars of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, who could rely on the particular position of

¹⁶³ M. B. Hatzopoulos, *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides*, (MEΛETHMATA) 30 (Athens, 2001), pp. 96–98.

¹⁶⁴ E. Badian, “Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia,” in E. Badian, ed., *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 37–69.

¹⁶⁵ M. B. Sakellariou, “The Inhabitants,” in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Macedonia* (Athens, 1983), p. 52.

¹⁶⁶ 8.144.2.

¹⁶⁷ See above, note 27.

Prussia vis-à-vis the rest of Germany.¹⁶⁸ Initially outside the borders of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, even after the abolition of the latter, it remained an entity the citizens of which had to be reckoned separately from the other Germans. The German unification of 1870 formally put an end to this paradox, but the antagonism between militarist and mainly Protestant Prussia and the Catholic Länder along the Rhine and in the Alpine region could resuscitate it any time, given the appropriate political circumstances, as it did after the Second World War. As late as in 1990 one could write a book under the title *Preussen und Deutschland gegenüber dem Novemberaufstand 1830–1831*. In a similar way, as late as the twenties of the third century Phylarchos could still try, though unsuccessfully, to make capital out of an opposition between “Macedonian barbarity” and “Greek nobility.”¹⁶⁹ In any case, the refoundation in 222 of the Hellenic League by Antigonos Doson did not repeat Philip II’s mistake, but integrated his Macedonians as full members of the Hellenes and thereby formally put an end to the Macedonian paradox. That did not stop efforts by Macedonia’s retrospective enemies to revive it, echoes of which we still read in the works of Atticist writers of the Roman period.

If one were to sum up the whole argument in one sentence, one might say that the distinction—indeed the opposition—between “Macedonians” and “Greeks,” went unheeded as long as the identity of the former was only a matter of ethnological interest, but surfaced as soon as the Macedonians aspired to become major players in Greek politics. It finally lost all pertinence, except as a literary topos, when the Romans put an end to any independent Greek political life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- I. M. Akamatis, “Ἐάνθος Δημητρίου καὶ Ἀμαδίκας υἱός,” in *AMHTOΣ: Τιμητικός τόμος γιὰ τὸν καθηγητὴ Μανόλη Ἀνδρόνικο* (Thessaloniki, 1987), pp. 13–32.
 M. Andronikos, *Vergina: The Royal Tombs* (Athens, 1993).
 ———, “Tombs at Vergina,” in R. Ginouvès and M. B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 35–39.
 ———, *Βεργίνα II. Ὁ τάφος τῆς Περσεφόνης*, (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας) 138 (Athens, 1994).
 E. Badian, “Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia,” in E. Badian, ed., *Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to Victor Ehrenberg* (Oxford, 1966), pp. 37–69.

¹⁶⁸ F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II* (Munich – Berlin, 1930), p. 32.

¹⁶⁹ Jacoby, *FGrHist*, no. 81, F 52.

- , “Greeks and Macedonians,” in Beryl Barr-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, eds., *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, (Studies in the History of Art) 10 (Washington D.C., 1982), pp. 33–51.
- Beryl Bar-Sharrar, “Macedonian Metal Vases in Perspective: Some Observations on Context and Tradition,” in Beryl Bar-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, eds., *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, (Studies in the History of Art) 10 (Washington D.C., 1982), pp. 123–140.
- , “Metalwork in Macedonia before and during the Reign of Philip II,” in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 485–498.
- H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopografischer Grundlage I–II* (Munich, 1926).
- M. Besios, “Νεκροταφεία του 5^{ου} αι. π.Χ. στη Β. Πιερία,” in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 645–650.
- M. Besios and Maria Pappa, *Πύδνα* (Thessaloniki, 1995).
- E. N. Borza, “Athenians, Macedonians, and the Origins of the Macedonian Royal House,” in Carol G. Thomas, ed., *Makedonika: Essays by Eugene Borza* (Claremont, 1995), pp. 113–123, originally published in *Hesperia Supplement* 19 (1982), pp. 7–13.
- , *In the Shadow of Olympus: The Emergence of Macedon* (Princeton, 1990).
- , “Greeks and Macedonians in the Age of Alexander: The Source Traditions,” in R. W. Wallace and E. M. Harris, eds., *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian* (Norman-London, 1996), pp. 122–139.
- A. B. Bosworth, “Eumenes, Neoptolemus, and PSI XII 1284,” *GRBS* 19 (1978), 227–237.
- Hariclia Brecoulaki, *La peinture funéraire de Macédoine: Emplois et fonctions de la couleur, IV^e–II^e s. av. J.C.*, (ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ) 48 (Athens 2006).
- Cl. Brixhe and Anna Panayotou, “L’atticisme de la Macédoine: l’une des sources de la koiné,” *Verbum* 11 (1988), 245–260.
- P. Charneux, “Liste argienne de théarodoques,” *BCH* 90 (1966), 156–239.
- Anastasia and P. Chrysostomou, “Τάφοι πολεμιστών τών αρχαϊκών χρόνων από τή δυτική νεκρόπολη του Αρχοντικού Πέλλας,” in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 113–132.
- A. B. Daskalakis, *Ο Έλληνισμός της αρχαίας Μακεδονίας* (Athens, 1960).
- Sophie Descamps-Lequime, ed., *Peinture et couleur dans le monde grec antique. Actes de Colloque, Musée du Louvre, 2004* (Paris-Milan, 2007).
- Stella Drougou and Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Βεργίνα: ό τόπος και ή ιστορία του* (Athens, 2006).
- J. R. Ellis, “Macedonia under Philip,” in M. B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulou, eds., *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1981), pp. 146–165.
- R. M. Errington, *Geschichte Makedoniens: von den Anfängen bis zum Untergang des Königreiches* (Munich, 1986).
- F. Geyer, *Makedonien bis zur Thronbesteigung Philipps II* (Munich-Berlin, 1930).
- R. Ginouvès, “The Palaces,” in R. Ginouvès and M. B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 84–90.
- W. S. Greenwalt, “The Development of a Middle Class in Macedonia,” in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 87–96.
- Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, “Mosaic,” in R. Ginouvès and M.B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 117–136.
- Chr. Habicht, *Athènes hellénistique: histoire de la cité d’Alexandre le Grand à Marc Antoine* (Paris, 2000).
- J. M. Hall, “Contested Ethnicities: Perceptions of Macedonia within Evolving Definitions of Greek Identity,” in I. Malkin, ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 2001), pp. 159–186.
- , *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago, 2002).
- N. G. L. Hammond, “Intellectual Life,” in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Macedonia. 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization* (Athens, 1983), pp. 88–91.
- N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia II* (Oxford, 1979).

- M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Actes de vente d'Amhipolis*, (MEΛETHMATA) 14 (Athens, 1991).
- , "The Language: The Origins of the *koine*," in R. Ginouvès and M. B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 79–80.
- , *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*. 1. *A Historical and Epigraphic Study* 2. *Epigraphic Appendix*, (MEΛETHMATA) 22 (Athens, 1996).
- , "The Boundaries of Hellenism in Epirus during Antiquity," in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Epirus. 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization* (Athens, 1997), pp. 140–145.
- , " 'L'histoire par les noms' in Macedonia," in S. Hornblower and Elaine Matthews, eds., *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 99–117.
- , *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides. Problèmes anciens et documents nouveaux*, (MEΛETHMATA) 30 (Athens, 2001).
- , "Cités en Macédoine," in M. Reddé et al., eds., *La naissance de la ville dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, 2003), pp. 127–140.
- , *La Macédoine: géographie historique, langue, cultes et croyances, institutions* (Paris, 2006).
- , "Perception of the Self and the Other: The Case of Macedonia," in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 51–66.
- M. B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulou, eds., *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1981).
- B. Helly, "Le dialecte thessalien, un autre modèle de développement," in I. Hajnal, ed., *Die altgriechischen Dialekte: Wesen und Werden, Akten des Kolloquiums Freie Universität Berlin 19.–22. September 2001*, (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft) 126 (Innsbruck, 2007), pp. 177–222.
- Myrina Kalaitzi, *Figured Tombstones from Macedonia, Fifth-First Century B.C.*, 1–2 (Oxford, forthcoming).
- E. Kapetanopoulos, "Xennias μακεδονίζων τῆι φωνῆι," *Ephemeris* (1993), pp. 13–30.
- Georgia Karamitrou, *Boion-Notia Orestis*, 1–2 (Thessaloniki, 1999).
- Georgia Karamitrou-Mentesidi, "Aiane," in R. Ginouvès and M. B. Hatzopoulos, eds., *Macedonia from Philip II to the Roman Conquest* (Princeton, 1994), pp. 29–32.
- , "Aianè, ville de Macédoine," in Julia Vokotopoulou, ed., *La civilisation grecque* (Athens, 1993), pp. 32–35.
- , *Aiani* (Athens, 1996).
- Angeliki Kottaridi, "The Symposium," in D. Pandermalis, ed., *Alexander the Great: Treasures from an Epic Era of Hellenism* (Athens, 2004), pp. 65–87.
- Angeliki Kottaridou, "Couleur et sens : l'emploi de la couleur dans la tombe de la reine Eurydice," in Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, M. B. Hatzopoulos and Yvette Morizot, eds., *Rois, cités, nécropoles: institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine*, (MEΛETHMATA) 45 (Athens, 2006), pp. 155–166.
- Franca Landucci Gattinoni, *L'arte del potere. Vita e opere di Cassandro di Macedonia*, (Historia Einzelschriften) 171 (Stuttgart, 2003)
- Kalliopi D. Lazaridi, "Τὸ γυμνάσιο τῆς Ἀμφίπολης," in *Μνήμη Δ. Λαζαρίδη. Πόλις καὶ χώρα στὴν ἀρχαία Μακεδονία καὶ Θράκη: Πρακτικά Ἀρχαιολογικοῦ Συνηδρίου, Καβάλα 9–11 Μαΐου 1986*, (Ἑλληνογαλλικὲς Ἐρευνες) 1 (Thessaloniki, 1990), pp. 241–273.
- Sylvie Le Bohec-Bouhet, "Réflexions sur la place de la femme dans la Macédoine antique," in Anne-Marie Guimier-Sorbets, M. B. Hatzopoulos and Yvette Morizot, eds., *Rois, cités, nécropoles: institutions, rites et monuments en Macédoine* (MEΛETHMATA) 45 (Athens, 2006), pp. 187–198.
- F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie pyléo-delphique: histoire et institutions* (Athens – Paris, 1998).
- Maria Lilimbaki-Akamati, "Recent discoveries in Pella," in Maria Stamatopoulou and Marina Yeroulanou, eds., *Excavating Classical Culture: Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 83–90.
- Manuela Mari, *Al di là dell'Olimpo. Macedoni e grandi santuari della Grecia dall'età arcaica al primo Ellenismo*, (MEΛETHMATA) 34 (Athens, 2002).
- S. G. Miller, "The Theorodokoi of the Nemean Games," *Hesperia* 57 (1988), 147–163.
- Vasiliki Misailidou-Despotidou, *Ἐπιγραφές ἀρχαίας Μακεδονίας* (Thessaloniki, 1997).

- D. Pandermalis, *Δίον. Αρχαιολογικός χώρος και Μουσείο* (Athens, 1997).
- , *Δίον: ή ανακάλυψη* (Athens, 1999).
- Effi Poulaki-Pandermali, "L'Olympe macédonien et ses premiers cimetières," in Julia Vokotopoulou, ed., *La civilisation grecque* (Athens, 1993), pp. 122–127.
- G. Rougemont, *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes I* (Paris, 1977).
- Chrysoula Saatsoglou-Paliadeli, *Τὰ ἐπιτάφια μνημεία ἀπὸ τῆ μεγάλης Τούμπα τῆς Βεργίνας* (Thessaloniki, 1984).
- , "Βεργίνα 1990. "Ανασκαφή στὸ ἱερό τῆς Εὐκλείας," *AErgMak* 4 (Thessaloniki, 1993), 21–34.
- , "Ναῶν Εὐστήλων, a Fragmentary Inscription of the Classical Period from Vergina," in *Inscriptions of Macedonia. Third International Symposium on Macedonia. Thessaloniki, 8–12 December 1993* (Thessaloniki, 1996), pp. 100–122.
- , *Βεργίνα. Ὁ τάφος τοῦ Φιλίππου. Ἡ τοιχογραφία μετὰ τὸ κνήγι*, (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας) 231 (Athens, 2004).
- M. B. Sakellariou, "Panhellenism: From Concept to Policy," in M. B. Hatzopoulos and Louisa D. Loukopoulou, eds., *Philip of Macedon* (London, 1981), pp. 128–145.
- , "The Inhabitants," in M. B. Sakellariou, ed., *Macedonia. 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization* (Athens, 1983), pp. 44–63.
- S. Scullion, "Euripides and Macedon, or the Silence of the *Frogs*," *CQ* 53 (2003), 389–400.
- Eudokia Skarlatidou, "Ἀρχαῖα γάλκινη ὕδρια ἀπὸ τὸ νεκροταφεῖο τῆς Θέρμης (Σέδες) Θεσσαλονίκης," in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 499–513.
- Eleni Trakosopoulou, "Jewelry in Macedonia," in D. Pandermalis, ed., *Alexander the Great: Treasures from an Epic Era of Hellenism* (Athens, 2004), pp. 115–137.
- Argyro B. Tatakis, *Ancient Beroea: Prosopography and Society* (ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ) 8 (Athens 1998).
- Maria Tsimbidou-Avloniti, *Μακεδονικοὶ τάφοι στὸν Φοῖνικα καὶ στὸν Ἅγιο Ἀθανάσιο Θεσσαλονίκης: Συμβολὴ στὴ μελέτη τῆς εἰκονογραφίας τῶν ταφικῶν μνημείων τῆς Μακεδονίας*, (Δημοσιεύματα τοῦ Ἀρχαιολογικοῦ Δελτίου) 91 (Athens, 2005).
- , "Ἀπὸ ἓνα νεκροταφεῖο προγενέστερο τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης," in *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 675–696.
- Ch. Tsoungaris, "Ἀνασκαφικὲς ἔρευνες στὸν νομὸ Καστοριάς κατὰ τὸ 1999," *AErgMak* 13 (Thessaloniki, 2001), 611–622.
- , "Ἀνασκαφικὲς ἔρευνες στὸ νεκροταφεῖο κλασσικῶν χρόνων τοῦ νέου ὕδραγωγείου Πενταβρύσου Καστοριάς," *AErgMak* 8 (Thessaloniki, 2006), 687–694.
- Julia Vokotopoulou, *Ἑλληνικὴ τέχνη. Ἀργυρὰ καὶ γάλκινα ἔργα τέχνης στὴν Ἀρχαιότητα* (Athens, 1997).
- H. U. Wiemer, *Alexander der Grosse* (Munich, 2005).
- I. Xydopoulos, "Νέες ἐπιγραφές ἀπὸ τὴν Πύδνα τῆς Πιερίας," *Hellenika* 50 (2000), 35–43.
- I. K. Xydopoulos, *Κοινωνικὲς καὶ πολιτιστικὲς σχέσεις τῶν Μακεδόνων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων: Συμβολὴ στὴν ἔρευνα τῆς γραμματειακῆς καὶ ἐπιγραφικῆς παραδόσεως γιὰ τὴν ἀρχαία Μακεδονία*, 2nd ed. (Thessaloniki, 2006).
- M. Zahrnt, "Amyntas III. und die griechischen Mächte," *Ancient Macedonia. Seventh International Symposium* (Thessaloniki, 2007), pp. 239–251.

Further Reading

The whole literary corpus about Macedonia had been examined from every aspect for decades, if not for centuries, with disappointing—indeed inaccurate—results. It is the archaeological and particularly the epigraphical finds of the last thirty years which have revolutionized our knowledge of the material and non-material culture of ancient Macedonia and rendered to a large extent obsolete most of the earlier scholarship. Who had dreamt of archaic sculpture in the cantons of Upper Macedonia, of supreme quality painting not only in the capitals Aegae and Pella, but also in the third-rate city of Heracleia

in Mygdonia utterly unknown until 1985, of self-governing Macedonian cities voting laws and decrees which instruct us more about the Greek institution of *ephebeia* than Aristotle himself? Thus, if one wishes to follow the ongoing discovery of this new Macedonia, he should consult the publications in which source material and provisional syntheses are most likely to appear:

Τὸ ἀρχαιολογικὸ ἔργο στὴ Μακεδονία καὶ Θράκη. The conference is jointly organized by the University of Thessaloniki and the Archaeological Service and takes place in Thessaloniki every year (20 volumes of proceedings (1987–2006) have already been published).

Ancient Macedonia. The proceedings of seven international symposia (1968–2002) of that name organized in Thessaloniki by the Institute of Balkan Studies have been printed.

MEAETHMATA: monographs of the Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity of the National Research Foundation. 21 out of the 45 nos published hereto (1985–2006) are devoted to Macedonia. The same Centre publishes the *Epigraphes Makedonias*, the systematic regional corpus of ancient Macedonia.

TEKMHPIA: a scientific journal initially edited at Thessaloniki and now by the above-mentioned research centre in Athens. 9 volumes (1995–2009), dealing mostly with epigraphy, numismatics and topography of Macedonia, have been published.